DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 473 EC 303 241

AUTHOR Hanby, Donna M.; Badiali, Bernard J.
TITLE Fairfield City School District's Gifted and Talented Program: A Collaborative Evaluation Study (1978-1994).
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 160p.; A data collection chart, with filled print, may not copy adequately.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Counselor Attitudes; *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Parent Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Self Contained Classrooms; *Special Classes; Student Attitudes; *Talent; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Fairfield City School District OH

ABSTRACT

This evaluation report reviews the gifted education program of Fairfield (Ohio) public schools since its inception in 1977, with emphasis on its full-time curriculum-based program for grades 4 through 8 and future needs. Evaluation was focused on assessment of student outcomes, and data were collected by means of surveys, interviews, observations, and artifact analysis. Four hundred eight surveys were tabulated, representing views of gifted program staff, classroom teachers, students in the program, former students now in high school and beyond, parents of former and current students, administrators, and counselors. Findings are discussed in terms of: (1) identification and placement, (2) program design and curriculum, (3) learning environment, (4) transition between programs, (5) program administration and support, (6) affective/student preferences, and (7) personnel selection and development. The evaluation supports the continued use of the self-contained model of service delivery. Much of the report consists of appendices which provide details of the survey responses. Contains 19 references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 473

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Fairfield City School District's Gifted and Talented Program: A Collaborative Evaluation Study (1978-1994)

EC 303241

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donna M. Hanby
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fairfield City School District's Gifted and Talented Program: A Collaborative Evaluation Study (1978-1994)

by

Ms. Donna M. Hanby, M.Ed.
Evaluation Director / GT Teacher
Fairfield City Schools

Dr. Bernard J. Badiali, Ph.D.
Evaluation Consultant /Assistant Professor
Miami University

© 1994

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	v
Brief History of Program	1
Overview of Goals and Aspirations	2
Goals and Objectives	3
Structure of the Program	5
Evaluation Design	7
Evaluation Matrices	9
Explanation of Surveys	11
Survey Summaries	12
Student Profiles (Artifacts)	33
Explanation of Findings	52
Interpretation from Findings	68
Summary	79
Appendices	81
Appendix A - Teacher Surveys (Gifted Staff and Classroom)	82
Appendix B - Student Surveys (present and past)	93
Appendix C - Parent Surveys (present and past)	115
Appendix D - Administrator Survey	139
Appendix E - Counselor Surveys	147
Bibliography	150

Acknowledgements

This evaluation report was produced through the efforts of many individuals. As director of this study I wish to express my appreciation to all who supported it.

First and foremost my thanks go to Dr. Bernard J. Badiali ("Dr. B."), for being a dynamic professor, mentor, partner, and friend. It was his teachings about the importance of program evaluation that began this whole endeavor. His support and confidence in my abilities thoughout this lengthy study of 18 months is greatly appreciated. Under his leadership and expertise the project became the reality you are about to read. He's also given much of his own time and effort in providing inservice with our gifted staff, as well as numerous hours meeting with me to guide the project to its completion. His professional and personal commitment has been beyond the call of duty. A big thanks also goes to Miami University, Department of Educational Leadership, for allowing this collaboration through Bernard.

Of course this study would not have been possible without the cooperation from Fairfield City School District, under the leadership of Dr. Charles F. Wiedenmann and the central office administrative team. Your support and assistance is greatly appreciated.

Under the direction of Carolyn Reinhart, former coordinator of the VISIONS program, the project was created and implemented thanks to her perserverance. She not only was the research's district connection but also a mentor and friend. Under her direction, the evaluation began as an independent study for me as a graduate student. She helped develop the format, the questionnaires, and was liaison between the district and Miami. She also gave much of her free time and effort as a sounding board in directing the path to the completion of the project.

Next, my thanks go to Jennifer Imhoff, a doctorate student at Miami University and research partner throughout the study. Her statistical expertise and assistance was greatly appreciated. She too gave of her own time over Christmas break, as well as numerous meetings before and after school. She helped to coorelate the artifact information and survey results.

Special thanks to Mike Ross and Midge Sterling who as district administrators supported and assisted the project by providing the needed time and financial support necessary to complete this document. Under their direction and support surveys were sent and received from not only district personnel such as classroom teachers, counselors, and administrators, but also to former parents and students. They are currently planning follow up correspondence as well as scheduling future meetings/presentations with all parties surveyed and those who may be interested in the results of the study. Thanks to their team of secretaries and aides too.

I can't say enough about the dedicated gifted teachers I'm fortunate enough to have worked with throughout this project. Without their devotation and love of teaching, their patience and perserverance of excellence, their constant revivification of teaching methodologies, and professional commitment to meeting the needs of these special students, the results wouldn't have been as glowing. In alphabetical order they are: Kathy Fitzpatrick, Chris Hartley, Rick Lapp, Carol Sacre, and Ellen Turkelson. They have helped throughout the entire process in numerous ways. They have given their time and efforts in creating and editing sections of the document, attending inservice about assessment and evaluation, and offering their informal observations during the interpretation of the data. Carol has also served on the evaluation committee and with the collection of the artifacts. Ellen, my immediate partner, has literally lived through the process with me, having to work around meetings in our room, substitutes on days the research was being conducted and numerous other interruptions. For all the former teachers in our gifted program I also thank you for your tenure in the program. These results are also in part your ownership as well.

A special thanks to so many. The evaluation committee of Liz Griffel, Pat McCormick, Carolyn Reinhart, Carol Sacre, Midge Sterling and Diane Thornton, for their assistance in the developing process of the study and input on the survey design and questions. Thanks to Dr. Eric Cook and the Senior High staff for allowing us the opportunity to use the high school's permanent records and yearbooks in the collection of the artifact data and to Chris Loy for her assistance there. Thanks to Dr. O. Conner and Dr. R. Hofmann, for their assistance in their areas of expertise in the early stages of the project. Thanks to L. Reinhart for your aide with the matrix.

Most of all, thanks to my family and friends for being patient & supportive throughout the various stages of the project. The managerie of papers that enveloped my life, the time you relinquished, and your love and support is cherished.

All in all, the study was a team effort. I am pleased to acknowledge those named above as well as many others who have contributed to our work. We hope that the collective product will be useful to all persons who were involved in the study. Certainly it has been a learning experience for all concerned. I especially hope that the study will be of use to Fairfield City Schools and to other districts regarding the development and conduct of future school improvement projects, especially in the area of gifted education

Donna Hanby
May, 1994

Tables

Page

Academic

Table 1 Gender and Number of Years in Program . . . 35

Table 2 Graduating Grade Point Average (GPA) 36

Table 3 Graduating Class Rank 37

Table 4 Number of Honor Courses 38

Table 5 Number of Advanced Placement Courses (AP) . 39

Table 6 ACT College Entrance Exam Scores 40

Table 7 SAT College Entrance Exam Scores 41

Table 8 Honor Society Participation 42

Table 9 College Acceptance & College Scholarship 43

Social

Table 10 Club Membership 45

Table 11 Club Officer 46

Table 12 School / Community Service 47

Table 13 Musical Activities 48

Table 14 Drama Activities 49

Table 15 Disciplinary Reports 50

Table 16 Sports Participation 51

Brief History of Fairfield's Gifted Program

Fairfield made a commitment to serve the gifted in the fall of 1977, by submitting a state teacher's grant to begin a pull-out program. Upon acceptance from the state, the pilot program began in March of 1978. The focus of this pilot program was on enrichment and independent study. 120 elementary students were served, grades 3-6 for one half day once a week. The following year seventh graders were added; the next year, eighth graders and then finally ninth graders were serviced in an art appreciation/independent study type format at the Freshman building.

By the 1981-82 school year, the elementary program was restructured so that two of the four elementaries were served through a full-time program at one ele. building and the other two elementaries were served at another ele. building in the same format. After three years third graders were no longer included as part of the formal program due to scheduling and staffing difficulties. For grades six through eight, an interdisciplinary team of four teachers in the areas of math, science, social studies and language arts, began a curriculum-oriented program.

Since the 1983-84 school year, the elementary gifted program has been a magnet program, housed in one elementary building. Two teachers are assigned to fourth and fifth graders for a full-time, interdisciplinary, academic enrichment focus. The middle school team continued in its original format, with the addition of a reading teacher as needed. The ninth grade program was discontinued.

In summary, Fairfield's gifted and talented program began as a pilot enrichment, pull-out program in 1978, remaining unchanged in focus until 1980. During the 1981-82, the program changed emphasis from general enrichment to full-time curriculum-based enrichment in academic areas for grades four through eight. This continues to be the focus of Fairfield's gifted program to date.

Overview of the Goals and Aspirations

Fairfield City School District has had a gifted program in place for the past 17 years. Informal evaluations have taken place over the years, but a formal evaluation has never been done.

There is talk at the state level of inclusion. This would mean that specialists such as L.D. teachers and certified teachers of the gifted would come into the classrooms and not remove students with special needs, to go to the specialist and their specialized program. If this be the case, our present gifted program would undergo major changes. This change possibility has sparked the gifted staff to begin exploring the validity of our present program and future needs within the district.

In early 1993, the state department (of Ohio's Special Education/Gifted department) chairs met with teachers, parents, students, and administrators throughout the state to gather input about the future of gifted education. The results across the state indicated that instead of disbanning present programs for the gifted, be it pull-out or full-time, that the move should include additional services and not the elimination of present services. Inclusion is definitely an important factor and is enough for some gifted students, but we should also provide pull-out programs, resource rooms, and in some cases full-time programs for other gifted students, according to their individual needs.

This project started as an intern/independent study under the supervision and curriculum graduate program at Miami University. Donna Hanby, had begun Fairfield's Gifted Program in 1977. Then, as a graduate student in 1992, she became interested in the longitudinal study of its effects, after hearing Dr. Badiali give an extensive presentation about the process of evaluation. After sharing with the gifted coordinator, Carolyn Reinhart, about Dr. Badiali's expertise in the area of evaluation, and her interest to complete an evaluation of Fairfield's Gifted Program, Mrs. Reinhart supported and obtained district support to initiate the project. Dr. Badiali agreed to support and be consultant for the project offering his experience and expertise with the evaluation process. The end product of the collaboration is this action research evaluation.

Goals

1. To determine the appropriateness of our present program goals.
2. To develop measurable student outcomes.
3. To determine the effectiveness of the present program in attaining these outcomes.
4. To determine the long-range effect of the program.
5. To determine what needs exist either within or without the program structure that are not presently being met.
6. To recommend and implement modifications in delivery of services.
7. To give all stakeholders access to the evaluation results and an opportunity for input into program modification and/or extension.
8. To create a model for continuous program renewal.

Objectives

1. To determine the appropriateness of our present program goals.
   a. To compare program goals to
      - Evaluation Matrix
      - Research in Gifted
      - Classroom of the Future goals
   b. To gather data from university contacts to determine the needs of the institutions.
2. To develop measurable student outcomes.
   a. To measure student outcomes.
   b. To rewrite program goals as measurable outcomes.
3. To determine the effectiveness of the present program in attaining these outcomes.
   a. To develop and implement a monitoring process.
   b. To locate, develop, and implement appropriate instruments to measure outcomes.
4. To determine the long-range effect of the program.
   a. To analyze the results of evaluation surveys.
   b. To analyze the results of informal observations.
   c. To analyze the results of artifacts.

Objectives (cont.)

5. To determine what needs exist either within or without the program structure that are not presently being met.
   a. To share the evaluation team's analysis of the data.
   b. To solicit feedback from relevant teachers and administrators.
6. To recommend and implement modifications in delivery of services.
   a. To analyze the evaluation matrix.
   b. To provide staff development.
   c. To improve the identification of all gifted students.
   d. To collaborate with regular education personnel in the provision of appropriate educational programs and services for all gifted students.
   e. To increase opportunities for family, school, and community involvement in the education of all gifted students.
7. To give all stakeholders access to the evaluation results and an opportunity for input into program modification and/or extension.
   a. To provide staff development in assessment.
   b. To provide staff development in consensus decision-making.
   c. To provide an open forum for reactions and suggestions.
   d. To offer an opportunity to participate in part or all of the evaluation process.
8. To create a model for continuous program renewal.
   a. To identify selected student outcomes.
   b. To identify selected program goals.
   c. To ensure regular program evaluations.

Structure of the Program

Approximately three percent of the students' from the district's fourth and fifth grades are identified and transported to the magnet school for a full-time program which is planned and implemented by a two member interdisciplinary team. The students in the elementary program are grouped for all their academic classes. The two (certified) gifted teachers are the students' classroom teachers for the two year program. The teachers team teach specializing in separate subject areas, in a combined open classroom setting. In addition to the gifted program, the students are involved in special classes which include art, music, and physical education. The students participate in grade level activities with the other students who are housed in the building with the exception of activities that are better geared to the two year cycle of the program.

The middle school program, serving approximately six percent of the school population, is planned and implemented by four (certified) gifted teachers as an interdisciplinary team in the areas of math, science, social studies, and language arts. The language arts and social studies are taught in adjoining classrooms. The science and math teachers are located in adjoining classrooms on the next floor, though not as physically opened as the social studies and language arts. Two years ago, the four were located on the same floor and proximity, with more room available/classroom. There are two sections of each grade level. The participating sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students are mainstreamed for special subjects and foreign language. Sixth grade students have one additional period per day of reading instruction for which they remained grouped as gifted students.

The identification process consists of several stages. First, lists of students are generated through the examination of reading, math, composite, and ability scores. Those who score at or above the 95 percentile and or above 125 on the ability test are placed on the initial list. Those who score at those levels in two of the three criteria are placed on a second list, and those who score at those levels in one of the areas are placed on a third list. A fourth list is generated which includes those who score lower than, but near to those levels. The achievement test data is converted to weighted scores according to the Fairfield Matrix for Identification, based on the Baldwin Matrix. The students are ranked according to the total matrix scores in these four areas.

Teacher recommendation forms (Renzulli-Hartman Behavorial Rating Scales for Superior Students) are requested for two to three times the number of students who can be placed in the program. Teachers are also encouraged to increase the pool of candidates by recommending additional students.

The third component is the Torrance Test of Creativity, figural section, is administered to all third, fourth, and fifth grade students. These tests are scored for all students for whom teacher recommendation forms have been completed. The scores for creativity are entered on the weighted matrix.

Next, a six item matrix is then completed on the nominees. Weighted scores are computed, and the students are ranked from high to low on the basis of the total scores on the matrix.

A three year history of data from permanent records of the nominees is then collected and recorded. Upon occasion, the Ross Test of Higher Cognitive Processes is administered to the pool for additional information.

Then a selection committee consisting of the gifted coordinator, an elementary principal or designee, a middle school principal or designee, one of the elementary team teachers, and one of the middle school team teachers is formed. The committee reviews the raw and weighted data on each nominee. Students with the highest matrix scores and supporting historical data are identified for the program without names being identified, until after the selection process is completed. Letters of invitation are then sent to the students and their families from the District Office.

The identification process occurs during the third and fifth grade years. Twenty students per grade level are selected at the elementary level and a maximum of forty students are placed in each grade for the middle school program. Students who are selected for the program at the elementary level are placed in the program at the middle school unless placement has proven inappropriate in fourth and fifth grade. Additional students may be identified through the process at interim and quarterly grading periods as appropriate. Parents may also nominate their child by completing the appropriate questionnaire which will clarify the reasons for their request. Individual testing may also be requested through the gifted coordinator who will contact the appropriate building principal.

Evaluation Design

The gifted student outcomes were based on the goals and objectives written in Fairfield's approved course of study for the gifted program. The goals are based in content, process, and product activities as well as in learning environment. In each area, specific goals and objectives were translated to measurable outcomes and placed within a designed matrix. Each outcome was evaluated by gatering data from several sources. These sources included teachers, administrators, parents, students, counselors, and former students. Data was collected by the use of surveys (S), interviews (I), observations (O), and artifact analysis (A).

In addition to assessing student outcomes, questions were generated about program efficiency and quality. These questions were converted to performance statements and placed on the matrix for consideration. An evaluation team which consisted of 1) an elementary VISIONS teacher 2) an elementary principal 3) an assistant principal 4) a middle school VISIONS teacher 5) a middle school principal and 6) the gifted program coordinator, designed and reviewed surveys and would determine what they would accept as evidence that a certain program characteristic exists.

The surveys incorporated four of the same questions asked by the state during their study of gifted programs. The questions that appeared on all surveys were: 1) What do we need to be doing more of? 2) What do we need to be doing less of? 3) What do we need to continue to do? and 4) What new or additional components are missing from our present program?

Every attempt was made to triangulate the data from several sources and through various methods, in order to get an accurate determination as to whether a student outcome has been achieved. A Coding Component was designed for each area to be evaluated. The areas were: Affective - Student Preferences (P); Learning Environment (LE); Learning Transition (LT); Program Design and Curriculum (PD); Identification and Placement (I); Personnel Selection and Development (PS); and Program Administration and Support (PAS).

The initial project began December 1992, by the writing of a grant for the state of Ohio. The matrix was developed at that time and has consequently become modified after not receiving the state grant. Our original proposal included extensive interviews (person to person and phone) and observations by university personnel (professors and doctorate students). Staff development would have also been provided for all stakeholders in the areas of assessment and consensus decision-making. We have provided staff development for the gifted staff through Dr. Badiali with the district supporting it financially, though not as extensively as our grant proposal would have provided.

In addition, the grant would have provided general staff development regarding the results of the evalution process, with the opportunity to react and make further recommendations. Dissemination of the results would have been presented through printed material, presentations, and open forums for the staff and community being apprised of the results. Finally, computer templates and forms would have been developed to enable others to replicate the successful components of this project.

The modified plans (minus the grant monies) resulted in a presentation to be made to the school board (May 1994), with the printed document (the 18 month project), as well as additional copies being made available at each of the seven schools within the district, at the district office, and at the Lane Library in Fairfield. Additional presentations are to be scheduled to be made for the various populations who took part in the study and those who are interested in the results of the study.

Evaluation of Gifted Program

Data Collection

Dec. 1993

Component	Methodology	Population Students(Present)	Population Students (Past)	Population Parents (Present)	Population Parents (Past)	Population GT Staff	Population Regular Teachers	Population Administrators	Population Specialists
PROGRAM	Surveys								
ID/Placement				X	X	X	X	X	X
Design/Curriculum		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Learning Environment		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Administration/Support				X	X	X		X	
Affective		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SCHOOL SUCCESS:	Surveys/Artifacts								
Class ranks			X		X				
SAT/ACT scores			X		X	X			
Honors/AP			X		X	X			
LEADERSHIP	Surveys/Artifacts								
Offices of Organizations		X	X	X	X				
Extra-Curricular/Outside agencies		X	X	X	X				
Reps to local, state, nat'l functions		X	X	X	X				
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT/SOCIALIZATION	Surveys/Artifacts								
Volunteerism		X	X	X	X				
Peer Tutoring		X		X	X				
Community Functions		X	X						
Jobs		X	X	X	X				
POST-SECONDARY ACTIVITIES	Surveys		X		X				
OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS	Surveys	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Dec. 93 CLR

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION OF GIFTED PROGRAM

Data Collection

Feb. 1994

COMPONENTS	METHODOLOGY	STUDENT A	STUDENT B/C	PARENT A	PARENT B/C	GT STAFF	CLSRM TCHRS	ADMIN.	COUNS.
PROGRAM:	Surveys								
ID/Placement		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Design/Curriculum		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Learning Environment		X	X	X	X				
Learning Transition		X	X	X	X				
Administrative/Support				X	X	X	X	X	X
Affective/Student		X	X	X	X				
Personnel						X	X	X	X
SCHOOL SUCCESS:	Surveys/Artifacts								
Academic			X		X				
Social			X		X				
POST HS ACTIVITIES	Surveys/Artifacts		X		X				
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	Surveys	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Revised Feb 94 CLR

Explanation of Surveys

Ten populations were surveyed about Fairfield's gifted program: 1) the gifted staff (June 1993); 2) classroom teachers, K-12 (Dec. 1993); 3) students in the program (May 1993) - identified as (A); 4) former students from the program and in high school (May 1993) - identified as (B); 5) former students from the program, post high school (May 1993) - identified as (C); 6) parents with students in the program (May 1993) - identified as (A); 7) parents of former students from the program and were in high school (May 1993) - identified as (B); 8) parents of former students from program and were post high school (May 1993) - identified as (C); 9) administrators from the district (Nov. 1993); and 10) counselors in the district (Dec. 1993). The student and parent populations' polled participated in the program from 1980 - 1993.

The survey items were catagorized as: Affective/Student Preference (P); Learning Environment (LE); Learning Transition (LT); Program Design and Curriculum (PD); Identification and Placement (I); Personnel Selection and Development (PER); Program Administration and Support (PAS); and several open-ended questions. Four of the open-ended questions appeared on all surveys they were: 1) What do we need to be doing more of? 2) What do we need to be doing less of? 3) What do we need to continue to do? and 4) What new or additional components would you like to see added to our gifted program?

The categorical topics were derived from the program's course of study and modeled from the state of Virginia's Gifted Program Evaluation in 1988. The open-ended questions modeled those being used by the Ohio Department of Special Education/Gifted Department, as they gathered input across the state from teachers, parents, students, and administrators, as to the future of gifted education in the state of Ohio.

408 surveys were tabulated, with a total of 13,056 pages of collated data summarized. Though the surveys were distributed over a period of 12 months and program familiarity spans from less than one year to 14 years, results yielded are comparative and do correlate.

Gifted Staff Survey Summary

In June 1993, teachers and the coordinator of the gifted program were surveyed. Their experiences range from 4 yrs. to 15 yrs. teaching/coordinating programs for gifted and talented students, with total teaching experiences ranging from 6 to 25 yrs. Five of the seven are certified teachers of the gifted (K-12), and the other two team members were working towards full time certification.

The following is a summary of the results of the survey. The complete results can be found in Appendix A. It consisted of nineteen questions to be answered as 1) NOT AT ALL; 2) TO SOME EXTENT; 3) TO A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT; 4) TO A GREAT EXTENT; and 5) NO OPINION. and six OPEN-ENDED questions. All seven members responded. The group of seven have worked together as a team for four years. All are concerned about meeting the needs of gifted students and are dedicated to the charge in doing so. One of the surveys was marked "no opinion" in numerous cases. It is surmised that the member thought to be indicating "to a great extent" instead of "no opinion", since the open-ended questions from the same survey expressed strong opinions and were answered in great detail.

When asked about about the *program's design and curriculum* 72% felt the **gifted curriculum goals** and **gifted curriculum objectives** are both reflected to a great deal in the total program. **A scope and sequence** for instruction being adequate for all teachers of gifted students was also viewed by 72% to a great extent. 86% polled felt that **differientiated instructional activities** for the identified gifted students provide a sequential development of skills across all grade levels served by the program (4-8) to a great extent. Only 14% felt (to a great extent) that the teachers who implement the program have received **adequate training**.

Under the category of *program administration and support*, 43% felt that the **supplement provided by the school building** to support the needs of the gifted program was adequate (to a great extent) whereas 43% responded not at all to the same question. There is a discrepancy between the middle school part of the program and the elementary portion. One has had a separate budget from the rest of the school, whereas the other has not.

When asked to identify the **strengths and weaknesses** of the gifted program, 57% felt that interdisciplinary instruction was a major strength. 43% mentioned differientiated curriculum, time spent with intellectual peers, and offering a full time gifted program as also noted strengths. 29% mentioned the lack of services prior to 4th grade and after 8th grade, and isolation as weaknesses of the program.

Suggestions for improvement included 28-43% of those surveyed mentioning: more communication among teachers, more coordination of subject matter (interdisciplinary instruction), field trips, community and/or school service projects, leadership training, including more areas of gifted and talented, and adding a significant amount of computer use and added technology.

Classroom Teacher Survey Summary

In December 1993, classroom teachers were surveyed by means of random selection. All seven buildings and all grades K-12 were polled. Sixty six responded to the survey. Of the sixty six, 41 were elementary teachers, 19 were from the middle school, 4 were high school and 2 did not check the level of instruction.

The following is a summary of the results of the survey. The complete results can be found in Appendix A. There were 10 multiple choice type questions and the same 4 open-ended questions that were part of all surveys used in this study. The survey items were categorized as : Identification and Placement (I); Program Design and Curriculum (PD); and Program Administration and Support (PAS). The multiple choice answers consisted of: 1) NO OPINION; 2) NOT AT ALL; 3) TO SOME EXTENT; 4) TO A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT; and 5) TO A GREAT EXTENT.

Under the category of *identification and placement*, 54% felt that **referrals** of students to be considered for the program are sought **from many sources** (to some extent). 40% had no opinion when asked about the **consistency of the identification procedures** throughout the system being clearly established and followed.

When asked what **additional services** are needed to be provided, under the category of *program design and curriculum*, 30% thought that primary services need to be offered, 28% felt a need for high school services and 26% felt alternate services for grades 4-8 was needed.

Under the component of *personnel selection and development*, 56% had no opinion about whether the **gifted coordinator** has adequate time to perform her responsibilities effectively.

When asked under the category of *program administration and support* about the need for additional inservice concerning the needs of the gifted, 49% felt adequately informed, 46% desired additional inservice, and 5% felt well informed in this area.

Under the open-ended questions, 8 felt a need for Fairfield to **service more** gifted students, 7 indicated **communicating and informing/inservicing** needed *to be done more*. When asked what we should be *doing less*, 16 indicated the **segregation** of these gifted students and 4 said **limiting placement opportunities**. **Communicating** was mentioned by 4 classroom teachers as something to *continue to do*, and **identifying and servicing the gifted** was also mentioned as well. The most frequent suggestion for *additional components* to the program was offering a **primary program** (5), adding an **arts/music** aspect to the program (4), and **servicing single subject areas for some gifted** (4).

Student Survey (A) Summary

In May 1993, students who were part of the gifted program were surveyed. The group was composed of 49 fourth and fifth grade students and 102 students from grades 6-8, for a total of 151. The sample group was composed of 51% female and 49% male subjects. The length of time in Fairfield's gifted program ranged from one to five years. Prior to being selected as part of the gifted program, 89% of the students attended elementary school at one of the four district buildings, whereas 11% attended an elementary school outside the district.

The survey items were categorized as: Affective/Student Preference (P), Learning Environment (LE), Learning Transition (LT), Program Design and Curriculum (PD), and Identification and Placement (I). These were 52 multiple choice type questions. In addition, there were also 7 open-ended questions to answer that were part of all surveys used for this project. The following is a summary of the results of the survey. The complete results can be found in Appendix B. Students were answer the questions based upon their experience since participating in the gifted program. Answer choices were: 1) NOT AT ALL; 2) SOME; and 3) A GREAT DEAL.

89% of the students indicated that they now **like things that are creative and unique** (a great deal). 78% indicated that they are now **interested in lots of things** (a great deal) too. 66% felt that they are **now able and willing to work with others**, as well as **like to do many things and participate fully** (a great deal) since participating in the gifted program. These were all part of the *affective/student preference* part of the survey.

Under the component of *learning environment and transition,* 89% said that they **greatly like** to learn by doing experiments (**laboratory**). 87% said that they greatly enjoy learning by the use of **simulations**. 75% agreed that they greatly like to learn in **cooperative groups**, as well as in the **open classroom setting**. 66% greatly enjoyed **working in a class of equal intelligent students**, only 3% said that they didn't.

Under the category of *program design and curriculum,* 72% of the students said that they **seek information by using a variety of sources**, as well as **are challenged with new ideas** a great deal of the time. 69% felt that they are **sometimes involved in the evaluation of their work**.

Under the category of *identification and placement,* 48% said that the **stigma of being identified as gifted** has never been a problem for them. 39% indicated that it was a problem at first, but isn't anymore; whereas, 13% indicated that it was a problem a great deal of the time.

Regarding the *open-ended questions*, 46% indicated that the *most satisfactory* experience in the program has been the **simulations**. The elementary and middle school populations differed in the *least satisfactory* experience. The elementary students said that **leaving their home school and** friends behind was mentioned by 12%. Middle school students (15%) indicated that **isolation** was the least satifactory experience. *Suggested additions* to the program (10%) said that **more involvement** with students outside the program was needed, whereas at the elementary level 35% felt that nothing new was needed.

Student Survey (B) Summary

In December 1993, students presently in high school, who were part of the gifted program, during the time between August 1985 to June 1992, were polled. Twenty-nine surveys were returned completed. It should also be noted that many student (B) surveys were returned from the post office as moved ("no longer at this address"). There were three types of questions on the survey: multiple choice (14), rank order (1), and open-ended (8). Categories asked included: identification and placement (I); learning transition (LT); program design and curriculum (PD); and the learning environment. The following is a summary of the results of the survey. The complete survey results can be found in Appendix B.

The first question asked, under the category of *identification and placement*, was whether **the labeling of the term gifted** was a problem for them. 48% indicated that it was a problem for them some of the time, 33% said that it was not a problem for them, and 19% responded that it was a problem for them a great deal of the time.

When asked to rank order their **preference in the way material was taught** to them while in the program, the number one choice was simulations, and number two was laboratory experiments. The least favorite two choices were lectures followed by reading material and then answering questions. There were seven areas to rank order.

The next part of the survey included twelve items regarding the *learning environment* within the gifted program. They were instructed to check all areas that they felt were positive while in the gifted program. 93% indicated that "the use of **techniques to make you think** (daily problems, debates etc.)" was the most important of the twelve choices. 81% felt that the use of **creative problem solving techniques** was a positive aspect of the program. The third most positive experience (74%) was having **leadership opportunities** within the class. There was a three way tie for the fourth most important aspect of the program (70%): **interdisciplinary approaches, working with a class of equal intelligent students, and the physical setting of the open classroom**.

Under the category of *learning transition*, 48% **felt prepared** (to a great extent) for the middle school gifted program as well as well prepared for high school, but only 15% felt prepared (to a great extent) for the elementary gifted program.

Under the component of *program design and curriculum*, 100% felt that the program's goals of **preparing students for the future** was reflected in the total program. 96% felt that their academic **needs were met** in the gifted program. 67% indicated that **multiple years of instruction** with the same teacher for the same subject area, for more than one year, was a benefit. When asked about **having the same team of teachers** for more than one year 62% agreed that it too was a benefit for them. But, 27% felt that their **high school teachers** did not know that they were part of the gifted program and only 15% felt that they knew to a great extent.

The final part of the survey was the *open-ended questions*. When asked the question about how **the program impacted** them academically, socially, goal setting and with their self concept several common reponses were noted. Under the academic impact, 14 students mentioned specific **academic gains**. Socially, 9 referred to the **social isolation** as participants in the program. 7 mentioned **goal setting effects** of the program and finally 4 referred to the **self-concept gains** from being part of the program.

When asked if they had the opportunity to "*do it all over again*" would they participate in Fairfield's gifted program, why or why not? **All but four students answered yes**, several positive comments followed. Of the four who answered no, the reoccurring response was because of social isolation from being part of the program.

Another question asked under this section was to describe their *attitude toward school* both before entering the gifted program and after being part of it. They were also asked to share their most and least satisfactory experiences. The **most satisfactory experiences** included: the **stimulating, academic atmosphere**; the **challenging curriculum**; the **teachers**; and the **sense of accomplishment**. Examples of the the **least satisfactory** experiences included: **readjustment socially in high school** and experiencing **too structured school work** (outside the program)

As for suggestions as to what the *program should continue, do more of, less of, or add to* the following were mentioned by more than one former student: **simulations** (8); **group work** (5); **field trips** (3); **interdisciplinary teaching** (3); and try to **include more students or interact with others more** so to avoid the labeling and isolating components of the program.

Student Survey (C) Summary

In December 1993, students who are currently out of high school and were part of the gifted program between August of 1980 and June of 1989, were surveyed. A total of thirty participants returned the completed survey. As with the case of student group (B), many former students have since moved and consequently their surveys were returned from the postal office. There were three types of questions on the survey: multiple choice (16), rank order (1), and open-ended (10). The categories included were: identification and placement (I), learning environment, learning transition (LT), and program design and curriculum (PD). The following is a summary of the results. The complete survey can be found in Appendix B.

The first question asked was under the category of *identification and* placement. The question was about the **labeling of the term gifted**. 50% indicated that it was not a problem for them, 45% said that it was a problem some of the time, and 17% voiced that it was a problem for them a great deal of the time.

When asked to rank order their **preference in the way material was taught** to them while in the program, the number one choice was through simulations, and the number two choice was through cooperative group work. The two least favored preferences were lectures followed by reading material and then answering questions about it.

In the next part of the survey included twelve items about the *learning environment* within the gifted program. The directions were to check all areas in which they felt were positive while part of the gifted program. 86% indicated that **working in a class of equal intelligent students** was the most positive aspect of the twelve choices. The second most frequent response was 83% and three of the twelve choices were chosen. They were 1) the use of **creative problem solving techniques** 2) the use of **techniques to make you think** and 3) **having the same team of teachers for more than one year**. 76% indicated that **teachers working as a team to teach** the material was a positive aspect of the program. The fourth most frequent reponse was at 69% and two items were indicated 1) the use of **interdisciplinary approaches** and 2) the physical setting of **the open classroom**.

Under the category of *learning transition*, 59% **felt prepared** (to a great extent) for the middle school program, though only 34% felt (to a great extent) that **the transition** was smooth going from the elementary to the middle school part of the program. 72% felt (to a great extent) prepared for high school even though only 24% felt (to a great extent) that the transition was smooth going from the middle school program to high school. 24% also indicated that they did not at all feel that this transition was smooth. Finally, 71% felt (to a great extent) well prepared for post high school with only 4% indicating not at all.

Under the component of *program design and curriculum*, 97% felt that their academic needs were met in the gifted program, with 66% of them saying to a great extent. 94% felt that **multiple years of instruction** with the same teacher for the same subject area, for multiple years was a benefit. When asked about **having the same team of teachers** for more than one year, 87% agreed with the statement. All 100% agreed that the **honor classes and advanced placement classes** at the high school level met their needs to some extent. But, 28% felt that their **high school teachers** did not know that they were part of the gifted program and only 10% felt that they knew to a great extent.

The final part of the survey consisted of several *open-ended questions*. One question asked about **the program's impact** academically, socially, goal setting and with their self-concept. 57% referred to the **academic gains** from participating in the program. 27% expressed positive feelings of the multi-year advantage of being with their academic equals, whereas 23% referred to the **social isolation** as participants in the program. 33% mentioned the **positive goal setting effects** of the program and 30% mentioned favorably about **the self-concept impact** of the program.

When asked if they had the opportunity to "*do it all over again*" would they participate in Fairfield's gifted program, why or why not? **All but four** post high school students **indicated that they would participate again**. The no respondents indicated that it was "too difficult to readjust to a non-creative" atmosphere after departing from the program. Social isolation was another reaason the four said that they wouldn't. Some of the positive reasons included: "It made me more independent and a better leader." "The best years of school were spent in the program." "It taught me about teamwork and challenged me individually to strive beyond standard goals."

"It taught me about teamwork and challenged me individually to strive beyond standard goals."

When asked to list their *present occupation and title*, 63% of the 30 were currently **students**. When asked about their *goals or what they still hope to do*, 43% indicated **additional schooling**.

Finally, when asked for suggestions as to what the *program should continue to do, do more of, less of, or add to*, the following were mentioned by more than one former student from the group. Nine suggested **more integration** with other students and four suggested expanding the program to include more students. Group projects (6), creative/critical thinking opportunities (4), keeping great teachers (3), simulations (3), and teaching as a team (2), were areas suggested to continue and/or do more of. Segregating (3), labeling, lecture-style classes, and testing (2) were suggested reductions.

Parent Survey (A) Summary

In January 1993, parents having students in the gifted program during the 1992-93 school year, were surveyed. The following is a summary of the results. The complete survey can be found in Appendix C. It should be noted that this was the first survey designed and distributed for this project. Fifty seven parents responded. They were asked to respond to 27 items about their child's attitudes toward school and school-related behavior at home. The response choices were (1) NOT AT ALL; (2) SOME; and (3) A GREAT DEAL. For each item, the parent recorded two responses. The first response (**B**), is the parent's perception of the student **B**efore the child was enrolled in the gifted program. The second response (**A**), indicated the parent's perception of the child **A**fter the child was in the program. For example, the first item reads: Likes school - Before students were enrolled, 68% liked school **a great deal**. After having been in the program, parents reported that 78% of the children liked school **a great deal**.

According to parents, there were several noticeable changes in the students since they enrolled in the program. When asked if students had lots of **ideas to share**, 58% said a great deal before entering the program, 81% said a great deal after being enrolled in the program. When asked if students demonstrated that they had many ways to **solve problems**, 35% responded a great deal before enrollment, 66% responded a great deal after enrollment. Finally, when parents were asked if students were able and willing to **work with others**, 54% said a great deal before enrollment and 70% said a great deal after enrollment in the program. **According to parents, there have been substantial increases in student's ability to share ideas, solve problems and work with others after students have been enrolled in the program**.

Parents were asked questions about the program on a second part of the survey. With regard to student **identification** for the program, 87% reported being informed of the criteria. With regard to **placement** in the program, 97% reported being directly informed

When asked if their child had been exposed to a **variety of teaching methods** while in the program, 97% said yes. Forty seven percent of the parents said that their child's instructional needs have been met extensively and another 38% said their child's needs were met adequately.

Only 3 parents of those responding said that the curriculum had not met the child's needs.

Eighty six percent of the parents reported that their child was adequately prepared for the program. About half of the parents said that their child had become more self-directed as a result of being in the program. Almost all said the **transition** to the program was smooth or adequate.

When asked if they supported the program, 56% said they strongly supported it, 23% said they supported it with some reservations, and 13% said they support the idea of the program, but have many reservations. Twenty six percent thought the district **supported** the program at a high level. Forty eight percent thought district support was adequate, while 26% thought district support was minimal or non existent.

The survey concluded with a series of **open ended items** where parents could express their opinion in narrative form. For a complete list of the themes of their responses, see Appendix C. Five or more parents made the same comments regarding the small classrooms and the need for more computers. Some felt that students in the program were too isolated from other children.

When asked what the program should be **doing more of**, parents wanted to see **less** segregation from others and more basic skills instruction. They wanted to see the program **continue to** emphasize group work, projects and simulations. Many parents wanted to see more computer related activities.

It should be noted that this parent survey was completed in January 1993. Many of the students were still struggling in the transition period of going from a regular classroom atmosphere, where success was quite easy, to the gifted classroom setting where they are working with a class of equal intelligent students for the first time. Our middle school, which houses grades 6-8 of the program, was very overcrowded and rooms which previously housed two classrooms were housing three classrooms and awaiting portable rooms to alleviate some of the building's population problems. In addition to this, the elementary program had a substitute teacher for the previous two months, which was another adjustment for the students as well as their parents.

Parent Survey (B) Summary

In December 1993, parents of former students, who are now in high school, were surveyed. Twenty five surveys were returned. It should be noted that the parent surveys were mailed in the same envelope as the student (B) surveys, and that quite a few former students/parents have moved from their former homes, therefore numerous letters were returned from the post office. There were 29 multiple choice type questions and six open-ended type. The categories were: identification and placement (I); program design and curriculum (PD); learning environment and transition (LE); learning transition (LT); and program administration and support (PAS). The following is a summary of the survey results. The complete survey can be found in Appendix C.

Under the *identification and placement* section of the survey, 67% said that they had **been informed** of the criteria when their child was identified for the gifted program, whereas 33% said that they were not informed In regards to the **child's placement** in the gifted program, 96% indicated that they were directly informed of the placement decision by school personnel. 24% said that the **perceived stigma** attached to being identified as gifted and placed in the program was not a problem for their child. 52% felt (to some extent) it was a problem for their child.

Questions under the component of *program design and curriculum*, 60% indicated (to a considerable or great extent) that the **facilities and equipment** available meets the program's instructional goals. When asked about their child being exposed to **various teaching methodologies** within the gifted program (lecture, simulations etc.), all 100% felt that they were (with 96% to a considerable or great extent). 96% felt (76% to a considerable or great extent) that the interdisciplinary approach of overlapping subject areas in a **thematic approach** was present in the gifted program. 100% agreed the the **use of challenging topics** chosen for teaching necessary concepts was present in the gifted program (84% to a considerable or great extent). 100% also were in agreement that the use of **creative problem strategies** and the opportunity for creativity in the gifted program occurred (88% to a considerable or great extent). 16% felt that the use of **individualized/independent study** to meet their child's area of giftedness was not present. The same percentage felt that academic instruction with **teams of teachers over multiple years** was not a benefit for their child.

Also, 20% indicated that they child did not benefit from having the same teachers for more than one year, but 72% felt their children did benefit from the multiple year experience.

Under the component of *learning transition*, 20% indicated that the **transition** from the regular classroom to the gifted program was not at all smooth. But, all but 4% felt that the transition from the elementary part of the program to the middle school program was smooth, and 96% felt that the transition from the middle school program to the high school was smooth. 92% felt that the goal of **developing self-directed learners/independent workers** and the management of one's own learning increased, due to the participation in the gifted program.

The *open-ended questions* gave the parents an opportunity to express their positive and negative feelings regarding the program. When asked about the **most satisfactory and least satisfactory** experiences their child experienced as participants in the program, the following was indicated: most satisfactory - "interaction between the teachers and students and students to students"; "a sense of pride"; "exposure to creative, dedicated teachers who broadened learning opportunities"; to list a few. The least satisfactory - "name calling"; "definitely labels child"; and "certain students rode the coattails of hard workers".

Suggestions for improvement included: communicate and involve parents, expansion of program to include more students, reinforce study skills, continue - group projects, simulations, independent study, and integration of subjects, add - counseling, more computer/technology, field trips, interaction with others and reinforce basic English principles.

Parent Survey (C) Summary

In December 1993, parents of former students, who are now post high school, were surveyed. Twenty-three surveys were returned. It should be noted that the parent surveys were mailed in the same envelope as the student (C) surveys, and that quite a few former students/parents have since moved from their former homes, therefore numerous letters were returned from the post office. There were 31 multiple choice questions and 7 open-ended type questions. The categories were: identification and placement (I); learning environment and transition (LE); learning transition (LT); and program administration and support (PAS). The following is a summary of the results. The complete survey results can be found in Appendix C.

Under the category of *identification and placement*, 70% indicated that they **had been informed** when their child was identified for the gifted program. 100% agreed that they were directly informed of their child's placement in the gifted program, by school personnel. 57% said that the **stigma** attached to being identified as gifted and placed in the gifted program was not at all a problem for their child.

When asked about *program design and curriculum*, 96% agreed that 1) the **program's impact** on the total educational program in our schools is positive 2) the program's goals of **preparing students for the future** is reflected in the total program and 3) their children were **exposed to various teaching methodologies** within the gifted program. 100% were in agreement that the interdisciplinary approach of overlapping subject areas in **thematic unit approaches** were present in the gifted program. 90% felt that their child's **academic needs were met** and 91% felt that the use of **creative problem solving strategies** and the opportunity for creativity was present in the gifted program. 13% felt that the use of **individualized/independent** study to meet their child's area of giftedness was not present. 92% felt a wide range of **developmental skills**, such as study skills and time management were present. 96% agreed that the use of **higher level thinking skills** occurred within the program. 17% indicated that academic **instruction with teams of teachers** over multiple years was not a benefit for their child, but 83% viewed it as a benefit. 21% said that their child did not benefit from **having the same teachers for more than one year**, though 79% disagreed.

Under the component of *learning environment and transition*, 87% agreed on two points 1) that the sense of community present in the gifted program was felt by their child and 2) the group dynamics of working on many projects as a team was found by their child to be quite positive and challenging.

When asked about the *learning transition*, 92% felt the **transition** from the regular classroom to the gifted program was smooth. 96% agreed that their child **was prepared** for the middle school program and 91% felt that the transition from the elementary part of the gifted program to the middle school program was also smooth. 96% said that their child was well prepared for high school and that the transition from the middle school program to high school was also smooth. The same percentage agreed that their child was prepared for post high school. Finally, 96% also agreed that the goal of **developing self-directed learners/independent workers** and the management of one's own learning increased due to the participation in the gifted program. 73% **supported the program** without reservations.

The *open-ended questions* gave the parents the opportunity to express their positive and negative feelings regarding the program When asked about the **most satisfactory and least satisfactory** experiences their child reflected upon as participants in Fairfield's gifted program, the following was indicated: most satifactory - "the communication skills learned"; "opportunitities for individual growth/exploration"; "more interested in school"; and "enjoyed all the interesting projects and team work." The least satisfactory experiences - "limited number of friends"; and outsiders making unpleasant remarks about the gifted students.

Suggestions for improvement included: adding additional technology, expansion of the program, accelerate course offerings, and less isolation from outside sources.

Administrator Survey Summary

In November 1993, administrators were surveyed regarding the gifted program. Fourteen surveys were returned. The questions asked included 23 multiple choice and 6 open-ended reponses. The following is a summary of the results. The completed survey results can be found in Appendix D. Choices for the short answer part consisted of: 1) NO OPINION, 2) NOT AT ALL, 3) TO SOME EXTENT; 4) TO A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT; and 5) TO A GREAT EXTENT. The survey items were categorized as: Identification and Placement (I); Program Design and Curriculum (PD); Personnel Selection and Development (PER); and Program Administration and Support (PAS).

When asked about the *identification and placement* of gifted students 57% said that the **procedures** used for identification **are effective** (to a considerable extent) for placement in the present gifted program. 38% indicated (to a considerable extent) that the consistency of the identification procedures throughout the school system is clearly established and followed.

Under the category of *program design and curriculum* 43% felt that both the **gifted curriculum objectives and instructional goals are reflected, clearly stated, and appropriate** to a great extent. When asked about the **present scope and sequence** being adequate for all teachers of gifted students, 38% had no opinion while another 38% answered to a great extent. 31% felt that the **program delivery system** was not at all appropriate for all areas of giftedness being served, but 61% disagreed and said they were to some or a considerable extent. When asked about what **additional services** need to be provided, 50% felt primary gifted was most needed, 36% felt alternate services for grades 4-8, 29% felt high school services were needed and 21% felt that kindergarten or no additional services were needed.

When asked about *personnel selection and development* 46% felt that the gifted coordinator has (to a considerable extent) adequate time for performing responsibilities effectively. When asked about their specific **responsibilities** as an administrator, within the gifted program, being clearly **communicated** to them effectively, 42% answered not at all. 31% felt either not at all or to some extent when asked about **staff development and better servicing** of gifted students being ongoing.

Under the category of **program administration and support**, 50% felt that they were adequately informed concerning the needs of the gifted whereas 29% desired additional **in-service** and 21% felt well informed. 31% felt that **coordination among buildings** to ensure student progress through the gifted program has not been fully and effectively developed, whereas 61% felt it has.

When asked about the *strengths and weaknesses* of the gifted program 5 of the 12 responses mentioned the teaching **staff**'s dedication and experience as strengths. The interdisciplinary **curriculum and teaming** were also mentioned. When asked about the weaknesses, **isolation, limited services and communication** were mentioned more than once.

When asked what the *program should being doing more* **serving more** students, **interdisciplinary teaching**, **prevent isolation, and inservice** other teachers were the most frequent responses. When asked what should we *continue to do* the most frequent response was **meeting the needs** of the students that are served and **isolation** was the most frequent response for what we need to be *doing to a lesser degree*.

Counselor Survey Summary

In December 1993, all counselors from the district were polled regarding the district's gifted program. The district has a total of eleven counselors with four of them returning the survey.

The following is a summary of the results. The completed survey results can be found in Appendix E. The survey consisted of eleven questions. Directions for the short answer type were: "Please indicate the extent of your agreement to each of the following items. Please circle only one reply for each question." Choices were: 1) NO OPINION; 2) NOT AT ALL; 3) TO SOME EXTENT; 4) TO A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT; and 5) TO A GREAT EXTENT. The survey items were categorized as: Identification and Placement (I); Program Design and Curriculum (PD); and Personnel Selection and Development (PER). In addition to the short answer questions, there were four open-ended questions.

In five of the six short answer questions, at least 50% of the repondents answered "No Opinion". It appears that knowledge about the gifted program is not readily known by those surveyed. When asked about **training for counselor personnel**, to meet the needs of gifted students being adequate, 50% responded "not at all", only 25% felt this occurred "to some extent". When asked about what **additional services** were needed for Fairfield's gifted population 20% indicated primary, 20% said high school, 20% indicated alternate services for students in grades 4-8, and 40% indicated that no additional services were necessary.

Regarding the open-ended questions, responses indicated that "we need to **increase the public's and school employee's knowledge, awareness and information about the gifted program.**" It was also mentioned to recognize these students and their talents as well as keeping them as enthusiastic learners, as much as possible.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

The gifted program was started in March of 1978 and was structured as a pull-out program. This format continued until 1981 when the self-contained model began. Since the program has varied in service models which has encompassed grades 3-9 at various times, the researchers felt that a necessary component to the evaluation should be to investigate longitudinal student profiles.

The student profiles included the high school graduating classes between 1986-1993. The subject group consisted of 320 students. Because of subject attrition, we gathered data information from 190 or 59% of the identified group.

Data collection involved several sources. Subject names were generated from central office records, gifted staff files, personnel recollection, high school yearbook investigation, as well as viewing Fairfield High School's permanent records. This data collecting process was quite lengthy but produced necessary quantitative research results.

The researchers realize that some subjects were missed due to incomplete data collection. Many of the original students did not attend Fairfield Senior High, therefore permanent records were not available. Some students were just involved in just the elementary or middle school portion of the program. Over the years, several other personnel members worked with identified students for only one or two years, as a pull-out option and longitudinal data was not available.

From the 190 (59%) sample there was also inconsistencies in the recording of the data. Some students did not have yearbook information noted, changes in permanent record transcripts, offerings of honor classes and advanced placement course changes over time, etc. But, in viewing these eight graduating classes we've obtained ample information from 175 (55%) of the sample to substantiate conclusive data.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

A. Academic Tables

A total of 19 areas were examined for the student profile part of the evaluation. Of the nineteen, 12 were academic and 7 were social areas examined.

Academic Areas used:

1) Gender & Number of Years in the Program*
2) Graduating Grade Point Average
3) Graduating Class Rank
4) Number of Honor Courses
5) Number of Advanced Placement Courses
6) ACT Math Score
7) ACT Verbal Score
8) SAT Math Score
9) SAT Verbal Score
10) Honor Society Participation
11) Academic Scholarships Received
12) College Acceptance

* It should be noted that the number of years in the program could be viewed as both academic and social, since students can enter and exit the program based upon academic abilities and achievement as well as social preference of environments.

For the reporting purposes of the artifact information 175 or 55% of the sample is used, unless otherwise designated. These subjects had at least eight of the twenty components used for the study. Subject mortality (attrition), due to physical movement out of the district or attendance at private high schools, attributes to the loss of former students from the 320 original members.

The tables that follow are the results of the collected data in the area of academics.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The table below indicates the **gender and number of years in the gifted program**:

Table # 1

Gender	# of Students	Prog. Yrs
Females	(n = 90)	4.04
Males	(n = 85)	3.89
Total	**(n = 175)**	**3.95**

Students can participate from one to five years in the gifted program. From the population studied, the average length of time is about four years and gender distribution is similar between males and females.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The following table shows the **Grade Point Average (GPA)** upon graduating from Fairfield Senior High School.

Table #2

GPA	# of Students
4.0 - 4.0+	34
3.5 - 3.9	58
3.0 - 3.4	36
2.5 - 2.9	28
2.4 or less	7

The chart is based on 163 students. The number of students with a GPA of 4.0 or better is 21%. The percentage of students with a GPA between 3.5 - 3.9 is 36%. The amount of students with GPA's between 3.0 - 3.4 is 22%. 17% had GPA's between 2.5 - 2.9. Finally, students scoring between 2.4 or less is 4%.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The following table indicates **class ranking** within the eight graduating classes studied:

Table #3

Rank in Class	# of Students
Upper 5%	57
Upper 10%	38
Upper 15%	19
Upper 20%	14
Upper 25%	13
Upper 30%	8
Upper 50%	14

It should be noted that 16 of the fifty-seven students who were in the upper five percent range, ranked in the upper 1/2 percent of their graduating class. Another 8 of the fifty-seven were in the top 1% range. Finally, 9 more of the fifty-seven were in the top 2% of their class and 6 were in the top 3%. Therefore, 68% of the 57 students were in the upper 3% of their graduating classes.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The following table shows the number of **honor classes** students have taken during their high school years:

Table #4

# of Courses	# of Students
1 - 5	63
6 - 10	44
11 - 15	8
16 - 20	15

It should be noted that 74% of the subjects took at least 1 honor class while in high school. 61% took between 1-10 classes and 38% took 6 or more honor classes. Some courses are offered on a quarterly basis as well some are yearly courses. It also depends on the year one graduated, the variety of offerings available to take as honor classes.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The following table shows the number of **Advanced Placement Courses (AP)** taken:

Table #5

# of Courses	# of Students
1	30
2	34
3	12
4	4
5+	8

It should be noted that the amount of advanced placement course offerings have varied over the years. The recent graduates have had more opportunities to take these courses and earn college credit for them. 50% of the study group took at least one AP class while in high school. 33% took at least 2 classes.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The table below shows **ACT College Entrance Exam** scores:

Table #6

ACT	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Range
Math	28	36	18	18
Verbal	25	33	14	19

It should be noted that students can take either the ACT or SAT for college entrance, so the scores only reflect those students from the study who took this test. 158 students took the ACT test or 90% of the study group.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The table below shows **SAT College Entrance Exam** scores:

Table #7

SAT	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Range
Math	633	780	360	420
Verbal	538	740	370	370

It should be noted that students can take either the SAT or ACT for college entrance, so the scores only reflect those from the study who chose to take it. A total of 105 subjects took this test or 60% of the students in the study.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Academic Tables

The table below indicates the number of **honor society** organizations of which the subjects were members:

Table #8

# of Honor Societies	# of Students
1	3
2	5
3	15
4	3
5	3
6 - 7	3

It should be noted that honor society participation was not consistently recorded in the permanent records or yearbooks used in this study. The chart represents 18% of the students in the study.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

A. Academic Tables

College Acceptance

Within the student profiles, 81% had transcript information which indicated they were to attend college and listed the specific college by name. If the information was not recorded in the student profile (permanent record), it was not included.

Academic Scholarships

In some cases scholarship acceptance was also placed within the student's record. Scholarship numbers ranged between one to six per student in varying monetary amounts. It should be stated that the information was not available if the student or counselor did not have it added to their permanent record.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

B. Social Tables

A total of 19 areas were examined for the student profile part of the evaluation. Of the nineteen, 7 were social areas examined as part of the study.

Social Areas Examined:

1) Club Membership
2) Club Officer
3) School/Community Service
4) Musical Activities
5) Drama Activities
6) Disciplinary Reports
7) Sports Participation

For the reporting purposes of the artifact information, 175 or 55% of the original student population is used unless otherwise designated. These subjects had at least 8 of the 19 components used for the study. Subject mortality (attrition) due to physical movement out of the district or attendance at private high schools attributes to the loss of former students from the 320 original members.

The tables that follow are the results of the collected artifacts in the area of social activities.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Social Tables

The following table shows the number of **clubs** that students were members of during their tenure at Fairfield Senior High:

Table #10

# of Clubs	# of Students
1	6
2	31
3	18
4	18
5	13
6	12
7+	8

It should be noted that 61% of the 175 students participated in at least one club during their high school years. 57% participated in at least two clubs and 39% were in at least three clubs.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Social Tables

The following table shows the number of students who held **officer positions in high school clubs**:

Table #11

# of Offices Held	# of Students
1	9
2	10
3	4
4 - 5	5
6+	2

It should be noted that 28% of the students who were involved in clubs were also officers within them.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Social Tables

The following table shows the amount of **school or community volunteer/service** events:

Table #12

# of Events	# of Students
1	25
2	19
3 - 4	11
5 +	21

It should be noted that 46% of the students in this study participated in at least one school or community service project while in high school.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Social Tables

The following table indicates the number of students involved in **musical activities** while in high school:

Table #13

# of Musical Activities	# of Students
1	15
2	16
3	10
4 - 6	9
7 +	4

It should be noted that 33% of the students in this study participated in at least one musical activity or extra curricular course.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Social Tables

The following table indicates the number of students who participated in at least one **drama activity** in high school:

Table #14

# of Events	# of Students
1	17
2	13
3 +	9

It should be noted that 22% of the students participated in at least one drama activity/event while at Fairfield Senior High School.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Social Tables

The following table indicates the number of **disciplinary reports** recorded for students while at Fairfield Senior High School:

Table #15

# of Reports	# of Students
1	3
2	3
3	2

It should be noted that out of the 175 subjects only 8 or less than 1/4 of a percent had disciplinary reports as part of their high school records.

Student Profiles (Artifacts)

Social Tables

The following table indicates the number of students who **participated in sports** while in high school:

Table #16

# of Sports	# of Students
1	30
2	18
3	11
4 +	13

It should be noted that 41% of the students participated in at least one sport while in high school.

Explanation of the Findings

As mentioned earlier, the gifted student outcomes were based on the goals and objectives written in Fairfield's approved course of study for the gifted program. The goals are based in content, process, and product activities as well as in learning environment. In each area, specific goals and objectives were translated to measurable outcomes and placed within a designed matrix.

A coding component was designed for each area to be evaluated. The areas were: Affective/Student Preferences (P); Learning Environment (LE); Learning Transition (LT); Program Design and Curriculum (PD); Identification and Placement (I); Personnel Selection and Development (PS); and Program Administration and Support (PAS). Every attempt was made to triangulate the data from several sources and through various methods.

Besides the above categories all 10 populations were asked the same four open-ended questions: 1) What do we need to be doing more of? 2) What do we need to be doing less of? 3) What do we need to continue to do? and 4) What new or additional components are missing from our present program? The results of these questions are incorporated within the findings under the coding components in which they correspond.

The completed evaluation process took 18 months to complete. Over the course of this time minor alterations of a few survey questions and their placement categorically occurred as the need warranted, in order to simplify questionnaires and yield a more efficient tabulation of their results.

On the following pages the results of the findings are classified by the coding component letter and number of question. The populations asked the questions are also identified. The Lickert scale format of questions was used to assure continuity of responses and allow gradations of opinions and beliefs.

Findings

A. Identification and Placement

I1. Parents from all three groups felt informed of the criteria used for identification in the gifted program. The results ranged from 67% to 87%.

I2. Placement decisions are clearly being communicated to parents (96-100%) but 20% of the classroom teachers polled felt that appropriate teachers were not informed of this information.

I3. Referrals are sought by many sources was the question. Two of the four counselors responding had no opinion, whereas 85% of the administrators agreed, as well as 72% of the classroom teachers.

I4. This question asked about the procedures used in the identification of gifted students. Is the procedure effective for placement in the present program? Of the three groups (counselors, administrators, & classroom teachers) polled only 11% of the classroom teachers disagreed.

I5. This question dealt with the policies of entry and exit from the program. Again, have they been clearly stated? Five groups were asked this question (adm., teachers, g. staff, parents B and C). The results indicated that the administrators and classroom teachers disagreed from 23% - 33% respectively and 15% of the teachers had no opinion. All other groups agreed that the policies have been clearly stated.

I6. This question was about the consistency of the identification procedures throughout the school system being clearly established and followed. 3/4 counselors had no opinion as well as 40% of the classroom teachers. 84% of the administrators felt that the procedures were established and followed.

I8. This question dealt with the issue of the labeling of the term gifted and whether the perceived stigma was a problem. Five groups were asked this question (students A, B, & C; and parents B & C). 57% of parents C idicated that it was not a problem at all whereas 44% of parents B found that it was to a considerable extent. Of the student groups, 17-19% said that it was a problem a great deal of the time, 39-48% said it was a problem some of the time, and 33-50% said it wasn't a problem at all, with student group B indicating the greater degree of a problem area. (53)

Findings

B. Program Design and Curriculum

(Questions PD 1-14 were asked to student A are part of the learning environment findings)

PD15. This question dealt with continuity of services grades K-12 being reflected in the total program. Four groups were asked about this (g. staff, parents B & C, and administrators). The majority of all groups responded "to some extent" with the exception of parent group B, the majority responded "to a considerable extent."

PD16. The three groups asked the next question were parents B & C and administrators. "Facilities and equipment available meets the program's instructional goals." All three groups ranked "to a considerable extent" as the majority response with administrators also ranking "no opinion" as a tie.

PD17. When asked about the program's impact on the total educational program in the schools being positive, parents B and C ranked "to a considerable extent" and "to a great extent" respectively whereas administrators ranked "to some extent" as their majority with 21% indicating "not at all" and 43% feeling to a considerable or great extent combined.

PD19. Does the program's goals of preparing students for the future reflected in the program? Of the groups asked this question all but 8% agreed with the majority feeling to a considerable or great extent.

Questions PD20 - PD26 were about the program's curricular goals and objectives, scope and sequence and delivery system. These questions were only asked to two populations, the gifted staff and administrators, since the other populations would not be familiar with these areas. Both groups responded to a considerable or great extent on all questions in this part with the exception of PD 24 - the program's delivery system being appropriate for all areas being served. The administrators felt "to some extent" (38% majority) or "not at all" (31%), whereas the gifted staff felt 43% "to a considerable extent" and 43% "to a great extent "

Findings

B. Program Design and Curriculum (cont.)

PD27. When asked what additional services need to be provided 50% of the administrators felt that primary gifted was most important. This was echoed by the classroom teachers with 30% in agreement. Counselors felt (40%) that no additional services were needed. The second need of service indicated was high school (counselors and classroom teachers) followed by alternate services for grades 4-8, for students not presently being served.

PD28-PD31 were asked to parents only:

PD28. All three parent groups agreed that their child was exposed to various teaching methodologies regularly (40-60%) or to a great extent (36-52%). All but 5% agreed, they had no opinion.

PD29. When asked about the interdisciplinary approach of overlapping subject areas, in thematic units being present in the gifted program, all but 4% agreed. 74-76% agreeing from a considerable to a great extent.

PD30. When asked if challenging topics were present in the gifted program, 9% had no opinion whereas all others agreed, with 69-84% "to a considerable" or "great extent".

PD31. "Concerning the gifted program's intent to adapt the approved district curriculum in ways commensurate with the needs of the gifted..." 32-47% felt "to a considerable" or "great extent" it had, with only 3-5% feeling "not at all":

PD32. All three parent groups and students B & C were asked if their (child's) academic needs were met in the program. Three of the five groups polled agreed "to a great extent" and the other two ranked it "to a considerable extent".

Findings

B. Program Design and Curriculum (cont.)

(Parents B & C were asked PD33-PD36. Students were asked similar questions under the learning environment section.)

PD33. This question was about the use of creative problem solving strategies and opportunities for creativity in the gifted program. The majority of both groups ranked "to a great extent" (44-50%) and 36-40% "to a considerable extent", with no one in disagreement.

PD34. When asked about the use of individualized or independent study to meet students' area of gifedness being present, the majority of parent B answered "to a great extent" (32%) and parent C's majority was "to a considerable extent" (48%).

PD35. Was a wide range of developmental skills, such as study skills and time management present? 84% of parent B poll agreed and 92% of parent C echoed this, though the majority felt "to some extent" or "to a considerable extent".

PD36. The use of higher level thinking skills occurred: "to a considerable extent" in both groups polled, 43-44% agreeing this strongly and no one disagreeing.

(Parents B & C and Students B & C were asked the next two questions.)

PD37. Was the academic instruction with teams of teachers over multiple years a benefit to the student? Parent and student C agreed "to a great extent" (35-45%), whereas parent B's majority ranked "to some extent" (32%) and student B tied "not at all" and "to a considerable extent" (26%). Only 6% of student C indicated "not at all".

PD38. When asked about the benefit of having the same team of teachers for more than one year, again parent and student groups C agreed "to a great extent" (30-42%) respectively. Parent B's majority was "to some extent" (32%) and student B's majority was "not at all" (31%).

Findings

C. Learning Environment

(Questions LE1- LE19 were asked of all three student groups. Questions LE20-LE21 were asked of parents B & C)

LE1. I like to learn by lecture: student A's majority (59%) responded "some". Students B & C were asked to rank seven different learning styles #1 as their most desired format to #7 as their least favorite. Lecture ranked 6 out of 7 for both groups.

LE2. I like to learn by reading and then answering questions: student A's majority = "not at all" (52%). Both groups of students B & C ranked this 7 out of 7.

LE3. I like to learn by simulations: student A = 87% said "a great deal". Again, both students B & C ranked simulations as #1 out of 7 items.

LE4. I like to learn by doing laboratory experiments: student A indicated "a great deal" by 87%. Student B ranked this 2nd whereas student C ranked this area 3rd out of 7.

LE5. I like to work in cooperative groups: student A agreed "a great deal" by 75%. Student group B ranked this style 3rd out of 7 and student group C ranked it 2nd out of 7 areas.

LE6. I like to learn by independent study: student A's majority responded "some" (58%), student B = 5th out 7 and student C = 4th out of 7.

LE7. I like to learn using audiovisuals: student A = "some", student B = 4th out of 7, and student C = 5th out of 7.

(Students B & C were to check the various areas that they felt were positive while in the gifted program - there were twelve areas listed.)

LE8. I like to learn when subjects overlap (interdisciplinary): student A = "some" (50%). 70% of student B and 69% of student group C indicated that they liked learning in this format.

LE9. I like to learn by more than one teacher (team): student A (54%) indicated "a great deal". 56% of student group B and 76% of student group C indicated that they liked learning by a team of teachers.

Findings

C. Learning Environment (cont.)

LE10. I like to solve problems in different ways (creative problem solving): student A = 53% agreed "a great deal", students B and C felt agreed from 81-83% respectively.

LE11. I like learning by using independent study: 52% of student A indicated "some". Student groups B & C agreed from 30-31%.

LE12. I liked learning about study skills and time management techniques: student A = 57% "some", student B = 30% and student C = 28% choice this area.

LE13. I like reading for interpretation: student A = "some" 57%, student C agreed 38% and student B agreed 41%.

LE14. I like using techniques that make me think: student A agreed "a great deal" with 53% responding. Student B = 83% and student C = 93% felt favorably in this area.

LE15. I like having the same team of teachers for more than one year: student A said "a great deal" (60%), student B chose this area 41% whereas student C indicated this by a 83%.

LE16. I like working in a class of equal intelligent students: 66% of student A agreed "a great deal". Students B & C chose this area 70-86% respectively.

LE17. I like the leadership opportunities in the program: 47% of student group A agreed "some". Student C agreed 55% and 74% of student B picked this area as favorable.

LE18. I like the open classroom setting: 75% of student A agreed "a great deal" and student C & B indicated this from 69-70% respectively.

LE19. I like being with the same students for more than one year (a sense of family/community within the group): 63% of student group A chose "a great deal" whereas student groups B & C indicated this from 52% to 59%.

LE20. Parent groups B & C were asked about the sense of community present in the g. program being felt by their child: Both groups chose "to a considerable extent" a majority of the time (29% & 39%) with parent group B tieing 29% in the category of "to some extent".

Findings

C. Learning Environment (cont.)

LE21. When parents B & C were asked about the group dynamics of working on many projects as a team, 12% of parent B and 4% of parent C did not feel it was positive and challenging, all other parents agreed (with 59% and 63% indicated from "a considerable extent" to "a great extent").

Findings

D. Learning Transition

LT1. This question concerned the transition from the regular classroom to the gifted program, how prepared did the students feel? 61% of student A group felt somewhat prepared and their parents (parent A) felt their child was well prepared (63%). Student group B (35%) felt prepared "to a considerable extent" and their parents agreed at the same rate (35%). Finally, student group C felt "to a great extent" prepared (37%) and their parents agreed "to a great extent" (53%).

LT2. When asked about the transition from the regular classroom to the gifted program being smooth, the majority of student groups B and C agreed "to a considerable extent" whereas the parent group B majority chose "to some extent" (28%) with both 24% indicating "to a considerable extent" and "to a great extent". Parent C (40%) indicated "to a great extent" for this question.

LT3. When parent groups B & C and student groups B & C were asked about feeling prepared for the middle school gifted program, all four groups majority chose "to a great extent" ranging from 48-59% of those responding.

LT4. Concerning the transition from the elementary part of program to the middle school program, student group A indicated that the transition was "okay" (37%) or smooth (35%) agreeing with their parents who felt it was smooth (38%). From student and parent group B, both felt it was smooth "to a great extent" (38%-55%). Student C felt " to a considerable extent" (37%) and to a "great extent" (34%) and their parents chose "to a great extent" (50%) and "to a considerable extent" (32%).

LT5. Parent and Student groups B & C were asked about their preparedness for high school. All four groups chose "to a great extent" a majority of the time, ranging from 48%-72%.

Findings

D. Learning Transition (cont.)

LT6. The same four populations were asked about the transition from the middle school program to high school. Student population C equally divided their vote (24%) from "not at all" - "to a great extent". [4% had no opinion] Only 7% of student group B voiced "not at all", all others from the remaining groups felt it was smooth, with the majority indicating "to a considerable extent - to a great extent".

LT7. Students and parents C (post high school) indicated that they felt prepared for post high school "to a great extent" 71% (students) and 57% (parents). Only 4% of students C felt "not at all".

LT8. When asked about the transition from high school to post high school, again the majority of both groups indicated "to a great extent" (52%-60%). But, 9-10% did "not at all" feel it a was smooth transition.

LT9. When asked about the program's goal of developing self-directed/independent workers and the management of one's own learning, parent group A felt their child maintained or increased in this area (49%-47% respectively). Both parent groups B & C felt their children did gain in this area "to a great extent" (36%-48%) and none felt "not at all".

LT10. When asked about the facilities of the program, parent A felt they were adequate (57%) and 19% felt they were excellent.

Findings

E. Program Administration and Support

PAS1. When asked about one's role being defined as program staff, the gifted staff agreed "to a great extent" (58%). Parent A felt that they were adequately informed (77%) concerning information given to them.

PAS2. 80% of parent group A felt adequately informed regarding their child's progress and involvement in the gifted program.

PAS3. All three parent groups were asked about their support for the program. The majority of all three groups "strongly support" it (48%-56%) and an additional 34% "support it" without reservations.

PAS4. When asked about district level support of the program, 74% of parent group A and 86% of the gifted staff felt adequate to a high level support for the program.

PAS5. When the same two groups were asked about building level support for the program, 78% of parent A and 72% of the gifted staff felt adequate to a high level of support at this level.

PAS6. Administrators and gifted staff were asked about the coordination among grade levels to ensure student progress through the gifted program. 86% of the gifted staff felt that it has been fully and effectively developed, whereas 85% of the administrators agreed, but not as strongly.

PAS6b. A second part to this question asked about the coordination among buildings to ensure student progress. 61% agreed with this compared to 86% of the gifted staff. 31% of the administrators felt "not at all".

PAS7. When the same two groups were asked about building support in the form of a supplement to the overall budget being adequate for the needs of the program, it yields different results depending on the building. At the middle school level there is adequate support, since there is a budget as a dept. in addition to the regular subject area budgets. The elementary program does not have a separate budget, only part of the grade levels' budget. The majority of the administrators responded with "no opinion" (55%).

Findings

E. Program Administration and Support (cont.)

PAS8. Both administrators and the gifted staff felt "to a great extent"(38%-42%), when asked about the number of staff members being appropriate for the number of students being served.

PAS9. When asked about inservicing concerning the gifted, only 5% of the classroom teachers felt well informed as well as 21% of the administrators. 49-50% of both groups felt adequately informed. Finally, 46% of classroom teachers and 29% administrators desire additional inservice.

Findings

F. Affective/Student Preference

P1 - P27 were asked of student and parent groups A. S will indicate student group A and P = parent group A in the following finding results. It should be noted that parent group A was the first to be surveyed. They were also asked to compare their child's feelings both before entering the gifted program, as well as after being part of it. Students A were only asked about their feelings after being part of the gifted program. The responses reflect the majority percentages for each population.

P1. Likes school.	S = 68% "some"	P = 78% "a great deal"
P2. Sticks to a project once its started	S = 54% "a great deal"	P = 62% "a great deal"
P3. Is observant	(only asked of parents)	P = 84% "a great deal"
P4. Has lots of ideas to share	S = 58% "some"	P = 81% "a great deal"
P5. Has many difft. ways of solving problems	S = 62% "a great deal"	P = 66% " a great deal"
P6. Is aware of problems others do not see	(only asked of parents)	P = 54% "a great deal"
P7. Uses unique and unusual ways of solving problems	(only asked of parents)	P = 66% "a great deal"
P8. Wants to know how and why	S = 50% "a great deal"	P = 84% "a great deal"
P9. Other children call him/her to initiate play activities.	(only asked of parents)	P = 46% "some"
P10. Asks a lot of questions about a variety of subjects.	(only asked of parents)	P = 77% "a great deal"
P11. Is concerned with details.	S = 50% "some"	P = 70% "a great deal"
P12. Enjoys and responds to beauty.	(only asked of parents)	P = 58% "some"
P13. Is able to plan and organize activities.	S = 50% "some"	P = 64% "a great deal"
P14. Has above average coordination, agility, and ability in org. games	(only asked parents)	P= 42% tie (some/grt.dl.)
P15. Often finds and corrects own mistakes	S = 48% tie(some/grt.dl)	P = 54% "some"

Findings

F. Affective/Student Preference (cont.)

P16. Others seem to enjoy his/her company	(only asked parents)	P = 60% "a great deal"
P17. Makes up stories and has ideas that are unique	S = 89% "a great deal"	P = 89% "a great deal"
P18. Has a wide range of interests	S = 78% "a great deal"	P = 75% "a great deal"
P19. Gets other children to do what he/she wants	(only asked parents)	P = 60% "some"
P20. Likes to play organized games and is good at them	(only asked parents)	P = 50% "a great deal"
P21. Enjoys other people and seeks them out.	(only asked parents)	P = 55% "a great deal"
P22. Is able and willing to work with others	S = 66% "a great deal"	P = 70% "a great deal"
P23. Sets high standards for self	(only asked parents)	P = 68% "a great deal"
P24. Chooses difft. problems over simple ones	S = 58% "some"	P = 52% "some"
P25. Is able to laugh at self (if necessary)	S = 55% "a great deal"	P = 48% "some"
P26. Likes to do many things and participates wholeheartedly	S = 66% "a great deal"	P = 55% "a great deal"
P27. Likes to have his/her ideas known	S = 53% "some"	P = 77% "a great deal"

PD28. Please describe how you felt toward school both before entering the gifted program and after being part of it. All three student groups referred to boredom and dislike of rote type assignments and unchallenging curriculum prior to entrance in the gifted program. When asked about after entering the program, the three student groups referred to a more challenging curriculum, being able to be oneself and learning in different ways as being positive. One student summarizes it by saying "Before the program I dreaded school and after being a part of it I dreaded the end of it."

Findings

F. Affective/Student Preference (cont.)

PD28-PD30. Students were asked to list the most satisfactory and least satisfactory experiences from the gifted program. Simulations were mentioned more frequently than any other area as the most satisfactory. Also mentioned was the cohension built by being in classes with the same friends over the years, and the sense of accomplishment in achieving a new goal. The most frequent mentioned response for the least satisfactory experience was the the adjustment to the social and changing environment outside of the program, either before entering and/or after leaving the program.

Student groups B & C were also asked to share how the **program impacted** them academically, socially, goal setting and with their self concept. Below is a recap of the results:

Academically - 53% referred to the academic gains from participating in the program.

Socially - 29% referred to the social aspects. Half of these referred to the isolating factor of a separate program and the other half shared the positive feelings of the multi-year advantage of being with their academic equals.

Goal Setting - 29% shared the positive goal setting effects of the program.

Self Concept - 22% referred to this aspect and in a positive fashion.

These two groups were also asked if given the **opportunity to participate in the program again would they**, why or why not?

All but eight students of the total two groups said that they would. The reasons why reflected the stimulating, academic atmosphere; the teachers; working with others; the sense of accomplishment; being more independent and becoming a better leader were selected responses.

The eight students who said that they would not said: it was too difficult to readjust to a "non-creative" post program atmosphere, the social readjustment from leaving the program, and two said that they would participate in the ele. part of the program but not the middle school.

Results also reflected that the **students were also quite active in numerous activities** both while in the program and after departure from the program. These can be found under P29 in student surveys B and C

Findings

G. Personnel Selection and Development

PER1. The question was about the gifted coordinator having adequate time for performing her responsibilities effectively. (It should be noted that the job description has changed considerably over the time that this evaluation has been completed. Therefore, answers will vary depending upon when the question was asked, and which of the two coordinators district/county was in charge at that time.) Of the three groups asked (gifted staff, classroom teachers, and administrators), administrators (46%) felt she had considerable time; the majority of classroom teachers (56%) had no opinion, and the gifted staff (72%) felt to some extent.

PER2. This question dealt with group's specific responsibilities, as program staff, being clearly communicated to them. The three groups polled were: the gifted staff, administrators, and counselors. The gifted staff (58%) felt "to a great extent" that it has been done. Both administrators and counselors felt "not at all" (42-50%) respectively.

PER4. When asked about procedures for staff development and better servicing of gifted students being on-going, counselors (75%) had no opinion and administrators and classroom teachers had tied answers of "not at all" (31-33%) and "to some extent" (31-33%) respectively.

Interpretation from the Findings

A. Identification and Placement

Parents felt well informed of the criteria used for identification for the gifted program. They also agreed that placement decisions had been clearly communicated to them. On the other hand, some classroom teachers (20%) felt that appropriate teachers were not informed as to the placement within the gifted program. This seems to indicate that notification of selected students should be communicated to the appropriate teachers, as well as their parents, within a similar time frame.

As to the identification process seeking referrals from many sources, this was viewed as quite adequate. Procedures used in the identification process were also viewed as positive.

Policies for entrance and exit from the program seem clearly stated to all asked except 23-33% of administrators and classroom teachers respectively. The policies are stated in the gifted course of study and the parent handbook. A suggestion might be to make sure each building principal has a copy and this information could also be shared with classroom teachers unfamiliar with the process.

The issue of labeling of the term gifted and whether the perceived stigma was a problem yielded mixed results. Parents and present students in the program and parents and students post high school indicated that it was seldom a problem. But parents and students from group B viewed the label slightly more as a problem. Since these are the students who are presently in high school, perhaps their high indication of the label being a problem is relative to their initial return to a system that does not provide special service at that level.

Interpretation from the Findings

B. Program Design and Curriculum

The general feelings about the program design and curriculum were very positive. Positive components included such things as: differientiated instructional activities for the identified students, interdisciplinary teaching units, creative problem solving, use of challenging topics, dedicated and caring teachers, multi-age grouping, meeting individual needs, and curriculum compacting were a few of the many mentioned.

Results do indicate that continuity of services grades K-12 isn't as strong as it might be. There's a strong indication from all groups polled that additional service of primary, those talented in the arts, high school, and alternate grades 4-8 options need to be offered, for students who are not in the self-contained program.

When asked if the facilities and equipment available meets the needs of the program's instructional goals, all three groups polled (parents B, C, and administrators) ranked "to a considerable extent" and half of the administrators ranked "no opinion" as their response. Numerous suggestions were indicated on the open-ended part of the surveys completed by the ten audiences. Such things as: more technology, more computer components (CD ROMs, networking, software, bulletin boards, and more accessibility) were mentioned numerous times. With the advancement of technological improvements at such a fast rate in recent years and the addition of the information highway to our way of life, results indicate that we need to provide the knowledge, materials, and experience for our students in order for them to be able to compete as well as be competent with these advancements.

Does the program's goals of preparing students for the future reflected in the program? All but 8% agreed with this, with the majority indicating "to a considerable" or "great extent". Again, technological advances were mentioned as areas to expand. Having a counselor attached to the program was also indicated numerous times. A third item mentioned more than once was adding mentorship opportunities for these students.

Interpretation from the Findings

B. Program Design and Curriculum (cont.)

Only two audiences were asked about the program's curricular goals and objectives, scope and sequence and delivery system, the administrators and the gifted staff. This would not be known by the other audiences polled. The results yielded "to a considerable extent" or "to a great extent" on all but one question. This was concerning the program's delivery system being appropriate for all areas being served. 31% of the administrators responded "not at all", 38% "to some extent", whereas the gifted staff split 43% answering "to a considerable extent" and another 43% indicating "to a great extent". In discussing this question with the gifted team members, some felt that they could always improve in the way material is presented within their class and thus indicated "to a considerable extent" on the survey. The administrators that indicated "not at all" did not elaborate in their reason for this response. It is an area in which should be explored more through either in-servicing, open discussions, observations in the program or other means of clarification.

All three groups of parents and students B and C were asked if their (child's) academic needs were met in the program. Student and parent group B's majority was "to a considerable extent" and all others ranked "to a great extent" as the most frequent response. Again, it should be noted that survey group B are those who have most recently "graduated" from the 4-8 program and making the reentry transition into the high school sector.

Several suggestions were made about expansion of services for the gifted students that are not presently a part of the program:

1) Investigate special classes for those talented in the arts.
2) To meet the needs of primary gifted, have at least one certified gifted teacher to serve each elementary building one day/week with the fifth day as a planning day.
3) To meet the needs of students in upper elementary grades, who are not a part of the self-contained program, have one resource person work with individuals in a revolving door format, as the need occurs. (one day/week/building + plan)

Interpretation from the Findings

B. Program Design and Curriculum (cont.)

Suggested Expansion of Services for those gifted students not already a part of the program (cont.):

4) At the middle school level, create "OO" classes for language and reading and/or other areas of giftedness as a partial 2 block format type program. Again, this could be to meet additional gifted students' needs who are not part of the program.
5) At the high school level, involve a team of teachers who encourage creative divergent thinking to work with identified gifted students (ie. independent study, mentorships, etc.)

There seems to be a need to address the perceived isolation aspect of the program as well. A suggested transitional period between the eighth and ninth grade year could be structured so that students could be involved in the 8th grade gifted program as now designed, or offer a second choice of being involved for only specific subject areas. This would also allow additional students the opportunity to participate within the program, as well as expose our present selected students to more classmates.

Interpretation from the Findings

C. Learning Environment

When students were asked about their learning preferences, all three groups ranked simulations as their most favorite learning method. The second and third preferences were by laboratory experiments and cooperative group work. Fourth and fifth preferences were the use of audiovisuals and the opportunity for independent study. Learning by lectures ranked sixth out of the seven choices and finally learning by reading and then answering questions was seventh. The results indicate that active learning is preferred over the rote style of memorization and regurgitation.

When asked about learning by subjects overlapping (interdisciplinary approach), 50-70% indicated that they liked learning in this format. 54-76% liked to learn by more than one teacher (team approach). When asked if they liked having the same team of teachers over multiple years, students A and C said a great deal (60-83%) and students B at 41%. Again, it might be noted that students B are the ones who have most recently exited the program and are in transition with the re-adjustment to a 6 period day with 6 different teachers.

All three groups liked working in a class of equal intelligent students (66-86%) "a great deal". Also, the majority of the three groups liked being with the same students for multiple years. They felt a sense of family/community within the group a great deal (52-59%). Parents (of student groups B and C) asked the same question chose "to a considerable extent" a majority of the time and parent group B chose "to some extent" tying in frequent responses. 69-75% indicated that they liked the physical setting of the open classroom. Results indicate that the multi-year experience has great benefits in working with one's educational equal, as well as a community of teachers and students working as a team.

Interpretation from the Findings

C. Learning Environment (cont.)

All three student groups like techniques that make them think such as: daily problems, debates, higher level thinking skills etc. 93% of post high school students, 83% of students presently in high school, and 53% of students presently involved in the program, indicated this on their surveys. Overall, all three student populations preferred working in groups, doing simulations or hands on activities over independent study where 30-31% of student population B & C chose this option, and 52% of student population A. These methodologies should continue and be increased according to the survey results.

Interpretation from the Findings

D. Learning Transition

These questions dealt with the movement from the regular classroom to the gifted program, the elementary program to the middle school program, the middle school program to the high school, and finally the high school to post high school (for students and parents from group C). Two types of items were part of this section - 1) the transition or passsage from one to another, and 2) the preparedness or state of being prepared for the next change.

The overall results indicated that the students felt well prepared for the middle school program, as well as high school and post high school. In regards to the transitional questions, there seems to be an indication that student A group (61%) felt "somewhat prepared" to enter the program from the "regular" classroom setting, whereas students in groups B & C and all three parent groups agreed more favorably. It could be interpretated from this a need to make this transition smoother by working more closely with grade three teachers and possible in-service as to the program's expectations and format. It has been a few years since in-servicing has been done and quite a few, new teachers have been added to the staff to warrant this.

As mentioned before, 7% of student population B voiced the response "not at all" when asked about the smoothness of the transition from the middle school to the high school. It could be interpretated that a transitional period between eighth grade and ninth grade being added to alleviate this result. By adding more students at the eighth grade level in selected single or blocked subject areas more students could be involved, diminishing the socially isolated perception. In addition, teams of teachers at the high school could work with these identified students in some capacity emphasizing creative problem solving, high level thinking skills and individual/group projects (ie. simulations or hands-on learning).

When student and parent population C were asked about the transition and preparedness for post high school, 9-10% indicated that the transition was not smooth. 4% of students C didn't feel prepared for post high school. Although these numbers are relatively low, it is something that we must be aware of and work to alleviate the negative feelings towards. A future study could investigate the transition and preparedness issues in greater detail.

Interpretation from the Findings

E. Program Administration and Support

All three parent groups were asked about their support for the program. The majority of all groups "strongly support" it and a total of 90% either supporting it or strongly support it without reservations.

Administrators differed from gifted staff in that 31% of the administrators felt there wasn't coordination among buildings to ensure student progress. 86% of the gifted staff agreed that coordination was done. This might indicate the need to communicate more closely among the buildings in some fashion to ensure student progress. 86% of the gifted staff and 85% of the administrators felt that corrdination among grade levels to ensure student progress through the gifted program has been fully and effectively developed.

There seems to be a need to coordinate the gifted budget so that the supplement is similiar throughout the 4-8 program. The middle school program has a separate budget (as a dept.) in addition to the regular subject area budgets in the building, but the elementary program does not have a separate budget or additional supplement of any kind. Since the students are originally from all four elementary buildings and these students become part of one building for the two year program, maybe a supplement could be added to equate the loss from the other three buildings to the gain at the magnet school.

Interpretation from the Findings

F. Affective/Student Preference

Students from all three groups were asked to share how they felt toward school both before entering the gifted program and after being a part of it. All three groups referred to the boredom and disliking school before being part of the VISIONS program. They also referred to the dislike of rote type assignments and unchallenging curriculum prior to entrance into the gifted program. As to their feelings after being part of the program, all three groups described the more challenging curriculum, more fun to learn, feeling more successful, and liking school more. It can be interpretated that active learning is the preference of all these students. Regardless to the years they were involved or the amount of time spent, their feelings were similar before and after participating in the program.

The students asked to list the most satisfactory and least satisfactory experiences from participating in the program. The most frequent response was the use of simulations. Cohension built by being in classes with the same set of friends over multiple years, as well as the sense of accomplishment in achieving a new goal were also mentioned numerous times. The least satisfactory response was the adjustment to the social and changing environment outside the program, either before entering the program and/or after leaving it. It can be concluded that active learning methodologies, being with a cohesive group over an extended period of time were benefits to all three groups of students and should continue. To alleviate the least satisfactory experience of the different social and changing environment outside the program, additional opportunities should be provided which includes teams of teachers and students over extended periods of time.

Interpretation from the Findings

F. Affective/Student Preference (cont.)

When asked if the students who have already completed the program (groups B and C) would participate in the program if given the opportunity, all but eight students said that they would. They reflected upon the stimulating, academic atmosphere; the teachers; working with others; the sense of accomplishment; being more independent and becoming a better leader were selected response reasons. The eight who said they wouldn't participate again gave readjustment to a "non-creative" post program atmosphere and social readjustment from leaving the program as reasons they would not. Therefore, a suggested transitional period should occur prior to leaving the program, at the end of the eighth grade year.

It might also be recommended to expand the program format in adding more creativity opportunities at the high school level. Finally to lessen the social readjustment period, students should have gradual "weaning" experiences in order to not feel so isolated in retrospect to those who are not in the program. Giving students the opportunity to work with non-competitive activities with students and teachers not from the program could benefit both groups.

Students are/were involved in numerous activities both during their school time as well as outside of school. This also allows social interaction with others to prevent the social isolation stigma of only being involved with those in the gifted program. These students have been as involved in sports, music, drama, volunteer work, jobs, etc. as any other student in their age groups.

Interpretation from the Findings

G. Personnel Selection and Development

When the gifted staff, administrators, and counselors were asked about their specific responsibilities being clearly communicated to them, only the gifted staff felt "to a great extent" this has been done. Administrators and counselors (40-50%) respectively indicated that they did not agree. This indicates that better communication and in-service might be needed for this area.

Staff development and better servicing of gifted students being ongoing was viewed as an "no opinion" response by 75% of the counselors returning the survey. Administrators and classroom teachers answering the same question split their responses between "to some extent" and "not at all". This would indicate the necessity to expand services of gifted students as well as offer additional staff development to not only these three audiences but for parents too.

It appears that increasing communication to all pertinent parties, as well as providing additional and ongoing staff development, are suggested improvements for better understanding of the gifted program. In order to gain support, understanding the needs of this special population must be known before it can be understood and supported to it's fullest extent.

Summary

The goal of this evaluation was to carefully examine the gifted and talented program known as VISIONS (formerly TAG) of the Fairfield City School District. Although the program has been informally evaluated over the course of its existence, a formal evaluation has never been done. Every aspect of the the District's program was evaluated. Comprehensive information was gathered about the quality of instruction, the longitudinal progress of students (academically and socially), the effectiveness of the personnel, the learning environment and its transitional effects, program administration and support, affective areas/student preferences, and the program's design and curriculum. Ten populations were surveyed. Artifacts were collected from the past 14 years. The results of this information gathering was a detailed picture of how well the program performs with regards to its own goals.

As districts and state boards of education continue striving to meet individual student needs, many options are explored. Should special need students such as the gifted be "tracked" and if so for what period of time? Should specialists such as G/T (gifted and talented) and LD (learning disabled) teachers come into the classrooms where special need students are placed, and work with them as part of a heterogeneous grouping as inclusion promotes? These along with various other issues are currently being explored locally as well as nationally, as improvements of the educational process is always ongoing.

It should be noted that ability grouping is not synonymous with "tracking" (Slavin, 1987, 1990). It may take many forms beneficial to gifted learners, including full-time enrollment in special programs or classrooms for the gifted, as Fairfield currently provides. Concerns relative to the self-contained model for gifted education have been expressed both locally and nationally. The concern seems to be centered on the perceived "isolation" of the program. It must be noted that more and more research indicates (Slavin, Rogers, etc.) that significant effect sizes (+.30) are being found in meta-analyses on ability grouping as related to high achieving or gifted students. Gifted learners achieve a significantly higher levels than equally gifted learners who remain in a hererogeneous classroom, exhibit a significantly more positive attitude toward the subject they study, and maintain a more

realistic academic self-concept when they are grouped with other gifted learners for the majority of their learning experiences (Kulik & Kulik, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1990). Slavin's "Best Evidence Synthesis" showed effect sizes of +.49 and +.33 for self-contained gifted at the elementary and secondary levels respectively. Please note that "out-of-level" testing was done with the students in this study who were in the gifted program. This is necessary to show the gains and not "top out" the achievement test. The same study showed the effect size of +.16 for the self-esteem of low achievers in a tracked program. This information might indicate that we should not be too quick to alter the delivery system of the VISIONS program.

This collaborative action research evaluation began with the premise that the gifted program and its staff were open enough to solicit the voice of all interested participants and then to report the statistical results, as well as grow and improve based on the yielded implications. We have been fortunate to work as partners with Miami University, under the expertise of Dr. Badiali and his experience in completing multiple evaluations of other school districts and programs in other states. This has allowed us to structure the process and its results as objectively as possible. We hope that this document will prove to be a useful tool for continuous progress and improvement in meeting the needs of these special students identified as gifted and talented. Like any successful endeavor, the challenge is to not only maintain but to enhance the high quality of education currently enjoyed.

> "...[S]chool programs providing special treatment for talented students usually produce good results. The talented students who are in these programs almost invariable gain academically from them, and they do not become smug or self-satisfied as a result of their participation. If anything, talented students may become slightly more modest about their abililites when they are taught in homogeneous groups." (Kulik & Kulik, 1985, p.4)

Appendices A - E

A - Teacher Surveys
(Gifted and Classroom)

B - Student Surveys
(Present, High School, & Past High)

C - Parent Surveys
(Present, High School, Past High)

D - Administrator Survey

E - Counselor Survey

Appendix A

Teacher Surveys

(Gifted Staff and Classroom)

Gifted Staff Survey Results
(7 responded)

COMPONENT. IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I5. The identificaton procedures used to identify gifted students consistently identify students who are gifted:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 29%
to a great extent --- 57%
no opinion --- 0%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD15. Continuity of services across grades K-12 is reflected in the total program:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 57%
to a considerable extent --- 29%
to a great extent --- 14%
no opinion --- 0%

PD19. The gifted curriculum goals are reflected in the total program:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 14%
to a great extent --- 72%
no opinion --- 14%

PD20. The gifted curriculum objectives are reflective in the total program:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 14%
to a great extent --- 72%
no opinion --- 14%

PD21. Instructional goals are clearly stated and appropriate:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 29%
to a great extent --- 57%
no opinion --- 0%

PD22. A scope and sequence (framework) for instruction is adequate to all teachers of gifted students:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 14%
to a great extent --- 72%
no opinion --- 14%

PD23. The differientiated instructional activities for identified students provide sequential development of skills across all grade levels served by the program:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 0%
to a great extent --- 86%
no opinion --- 14%

PD24. The program delivery system is appropriate for all areas of giftedness being served:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 43%
to a great extent --- 43%
no opinion --- 14%

PD26. Instructional resources used in classrooms and program services are consistently appropriate for implementing the curriculum:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 29%
to a great extent --- 42%
no opinion --- 29%

PD27. The teachers who implement the instructional program have received adequate training:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 29%
to a considerable extent --- 43%
to a great extent --- 14%
no opinion --- 14%

COMPONENT: PERSONNEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

PER1. The gifted coordinator has adequate time for performing responsibilites effectively:

not at all --- 14%
to some extent --- 72%
to a considerable extent --- 14%
to a great extent --- 0%
no opinion --- 0%

PER2. Your specific responsbilities as program staff have been clearly communicated to you:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 14%
to a great extent --- 58%
no opinion --- 14%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

PAS1. As program staff, your role in the gifted program has been clearly defined:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 14%
to a great extent --- 58%
no opinion --- 14%

PAS4. District Administrators have been supportive in implemented the program.

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 57%
to a great extent --- 29%
no opinion --- 0%

PAS5. Building Administrators have been supportive in implementing the program:

not at all --- 14%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 43%
to a great extent --- 29%
no opinion --- 0%

PAS6. Coordination among grade levels to ensure student progress through the gifted program has been fully and effectively developed:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 43%
to a great extent --- 43%
no opinion --- 14%

PAS6. Coordination among schools to ensure student progress through the gifted program has been fully and effectively developed:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 43%
to a great extent --- 29%
no opinion --- 14%

PAS7. The supplement provided by your school building to the overall budget of the gifted program is adequate for the needs of the program:

not at all --- 43%
to some extent --- 14%
to a considerable extent --- 0%
to a great extent --- 43%
no opinion --- 0%

PAS8. The number of staff members working with the gifted students in the program is appropriate for the number of students served:

not at all --- 0%
to some extent --- 0%
to a considerable extent --- 29%
to a great extent --- 42%
no opinion --- 29%

Please identify what you consider to be the major strengths and weaknesses of the gifted program:

Strengths - interdisciplinary instruction (4); differentiated curriculum (3); time spent with intellectual peers (3); full time program is advantageous over pull-out programs found in most districts (3); cohesiveness of teams of teachers (2); multiple grades with the same teachers prevent "lost time" in review (2); long-range planning of the skill building process throughout the grades (2); students' individual strengths/weaknesses are well known by the teachers (2); concern of gifted staff for individual students; support of students - cognitively, academically,and affectively; full time program causes parents to literally move into the district from other schools locally and out of state for the opportunity for their child(ren) to be screened; smooth progression from elementary to middle school skill wise; environment is different from traditional; creativity component growth as a group throughout the years; program models Ohio's *Classroom of the Future* in true teaming and not just turn teaching or departmentalization.

Weaknesses - lack of services before 4th grade and after 8th grade (2); perceived isolation - socially (2); limited facilities; no elementary budget as in middle school; lack of other similar grade level teams to work with (always singled out one grade level or the other, so students are seldom ever with both 4th/5th in assemblies, lunch, field trips, and other activities - team is forced to split or be the only grade level present most of the time); no total staff inservice relative to the needs of the gifted; no counselor assigned to the program; no parent support group; lack of flexibility due to scheduling constraints, overcrowding, bus availablity etc.; limitations on anyone publishing or even saying anything good about the program, to not cause "attention" to it, based upon views of others outside the program; lack of recognition of the unique qualities of the teachers and programs in special education, because they do not deal with the norm, yet their job is just as exemplary individualizing and dealing with special needs; it is taken for granted or perceived as "cushiony"; more math/science coordination; further expansion of horizontal enrichment in math; more interdisciplinary endeavors; meeting affective needs more; need to be more open to change, focusing on what's best for students.

What do you believe we need to be doing more of?

more communication between teachers (2); more coordination of subject matter (interdisciplinary instruction) (2); field trips (2); community and school service projects (2); leadership training (2); positive reinforcement of gifted students and gifted staff from administration (bldg; & district) (2); include other areas of gifted and talented (2); more education on up-to-date research with gifted as well as all areas of instruction (self educated, university classes etc.); gifted staff meetings (sharing ideas, problems, and issues relative to gifted ed.; more team teaching; more services before and after present 4-8 program; and more communication with parents.

What do you believe we need to be doing less of?

defending the program; perceived isolation (need to find a way to defry that charge); less lecture or teacher dominated discussions; allow students the opportunity to learn material through discovery and research; complaining; and less basics.

What do you believe we need to continue to do?

coordination between grades and buildings (3); the program for some and extending services to others (2); continue doing what's best for gifted students; provide a variety of enrichment activities; offer opportunities not made available in a traditional setting (ie. cooperative grping, student choice of topics of interest etc.); use of computers (need more technology - CD ROM's, modems, networking); self motivation; continue that which has proved to be effective is presented; and prepare for the future of gifted ed.

What new or additional components are missing from our present program?

continuum range of services (K-12) (2); significant amount of computer use and added technology (2); parent group; identification of underachievers and poor test takers; time constraints limit interdisciplinary planning and implementation; further curriculum development in math; critical thinking in math; communication about what we are doing - assisting others, collaborating with other teachers, learning and growing as peer coaches; mentorship program for students; and business partnership for the gifted program.

Classroom Teacher Survey Results
(66 responded)

Level of Instruction:

__41__ Ele., __19__ Middle, __4__ High, __2__ undefined

Directions. Please indicate the extent of your agreement to each of the following items. Please circle one reply:

1 = no opinion
2 = not at all
3 = to some extent
4 = to a considerable extent
5 = to a great extent

COMPONENT: IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I2. Placement decisions for gifted students are clearly communicated to the appropriate teachers:

1 = 18% 2 = 20% 3 = 32% 4 = 28% 5 = 2%

I3. Referrals of students to be considered for the program are sought from many sources:

1 = 12% 2 = 16% 3 = 54% 4 = 15% 5 = 3%

I4. The procedure used for identification of gifted students is effective for placement in the present gifted program:

1 = 22% 2 = 11% 3 = 38% 4 = 26% 5 = 3%

I5. Policies on entry into and exit from the program have been clearly stated and communicated:

1 = 15% 2 = 33% 3 = 33% 4 = 14% 5 = 5%

I6. The consistency of the identification procedures throughout the school system is clearly established and followed:

1 = 40% 2 = 17% 3 = 16% 4 = 17% 5 = 10%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD27. The implemented program provides services to students in grades 4-8. In your opinion, what additional services need to be provided? Please check all that are appropriate:

__5%__ Kindergarten __30%__ Primary __28%__ H. School

__26%__ Alternate Services (Grades 4-8) __11%__ None

COMPONENT: PERSONNEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

PER1. The gifted coordinator has adequate time for performing her responsibilities effectively:

1 = 56% 2 = 3% 3 = 14% 4 = 16% 5 = 11%

PER4. Procedures for staff development and better servicing of gifted students is ongoing:

1 = 22% 2 = 33% 3 = 33% 4 = 11% 5 = 1%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

PAS8. The number of staff members working with gifted students in the program is appropriate for the number of students being served:

1 = 36% 2 = 13% 3 = 8% 4 = 27% 5 = 16%

PAS9. As a classroom teacher I am:

__5%__ well informed concerning the needs of the gifted.

__49%__ adequately informed concerning the needs of the gifted.

__46%__ desire additional in-service concerning the gifted.

What do we need to be doing more of?

Serving more gifted students (8); communicating (7); informing/inservice (7); promoting the creative process; include the arts & music to the program (5); expand to serve primary grades (5);expand placement to include more students (4); more involvement with other students outside the program (3); listening/accepting input from classroom teachers (2); challenging all students rather than focussing on the gifted (2); & add components to present program.

Comments: "I don't like 4-8 only, take 1-3 also. Teachers don't have "extra" time so let the gifted go to the gifted teacher one day/wk. for program. All bldgs. feed to 1 gifted teacher at 1 ele. bldg.(ie. Mon = 1st grade etc.)" " Implementing a study skills program early in the program & developing more sophisticated skills as students advance through the program." "Reaching out to kids with special needs but not necessarily identified for the program." "Target the strengths of the students in the program - more individualized instruction/ projects in their strong areas." "Provide enrichment services for grades 1-3. We need to know how to service g. studentss within our classroom. Are we excluding students who don't test well?"

What do we need to be doing less of?

Segregating these students (16); limit placement opportunities (4); placating vocal parents (2); & surveys. Comments: "Forcing these students into the regular classroom when they aren't ready for it. I feel your staff does an excellent job in communicating to me." "Gifted students need to function and offer their expertise to others." "Taking ele. students away from their home school." "Less stress from parents onto teachers."

What do we need to continue to do?

Communicate (4); inservice (2); identifying & servicing the gifted. Comments: "Promote advanced material and more challenging activities as you have in the past. It is an exceptionally good phase of your program." "Service all students' gifts at all levels in the classrooms as well as in special programs." Grouping gifted children together so that their emotional needs and social needs can be met." "Keep the gifted together . . . there is a need for them to communicate with/among each other. They do not stimulate others in a regular classroom." "Enriching students' lives and trying to meet their needs." "Continue to develop problem solving skills, group work, and leadership abilities as the program already does." "Challenge all gifted kids." "Evaluate the program."

What new or additional components would you like to see added to our gifted program?

Primary program (5); Arts/Music aspect added to program (4); servicing single subject areas for some gifted (4); trained aides (2); reduce isolation (2); more social interaction with children not in program (2); add pull out program for those not in fulltime program (all grade levels).

Comments: "A resource person should be available to work in a classroom during a particular unit." "We need to be doing 'gifted curriculum' whenever possible in the reg. heterogeneous classroom." "A primary ele. program. We have 'many' children who meet qualifications. It would be much more beneficial to service these children as a group, rather than teachers trying to develop programs that meet their needs." "The program should be housed at each ind. school so teachers could work with students according to the subject they're gifted in." "Isolation. 9th grade must be a frightening situation for these children, when they're put back into the regular program."

Appendix B

Student Surveys

(Past and Present)

Student Survey (A)

151 responded [49*4th/5th, 102*6th-8th]

Please complete the following.

Male/Female 74/76 (49%/51%) Grade Level 4-8 Length of time in program 1-5 yrs.

Elementary Home School (before entering the program) district ele./other

Please complete the following survey based on your experiences since participating in the gifted program in Fairfield.

	Not At All	Some	A Great Deal
P1. I like school.	3%	68%	29%
P2. I stick to a project once it is started.	4%	42%	54%
P4. I have lots of ideas to share.	3%	58%	39%
P5. I have learned different ways of solving problems.	1%	37%	62%
P8. I wonder how and why things work as they do.	6%	44%	50%
P11. I am concerned with details.	8%	50%	42%
P13. I am able to plan and organize activities.	8%	50%	42%
P15. I can often find and correct my own mistakes.	4%	48%	48%
P17. I like things that are creative and unique.	1%	11%	89%
P18. I am interested in lots of things.	1%	21%	78%
P22. I am able and willing to work with others.	1%	33%	66%
P23. I set high standards for myself.	1%	39%	60%
P24. I enjoy problem solving.	16%	58%	26%
P25. I am able to laugh at myself when necessary.	3%	42%	55%
P26. I like to do many things and participate fully.	1%	33%	66%
P27. I like to participate in class discussions.	9%	53%	38%

COMPONENT: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSITION

	Not At All	Some	A Great Deal
LE1. I like to learn when am told about a topic (lecture)	26%	59%	15%
LE2. I like to learn by reading material & answering questions about it (compr)	52%	42%	6%
LE3. I like to learn by pretending (simulations)	1%	12%	87%
LE4. I like to learn by doing experiments (laboratory)	0%	11%	89%
LE5. I like to work in groups (cooperation)	1%	24%	75%
LE6. I like to learn on my own (independent study)	23%	58%	19%
LE7. I like to learn using filmstrips, overheads, VCRs etc. (audiovisuals)	14%	47%	39%
LE8. I like to learn when subject areas overlap (interdisciplinary)	5%	50%	45%
LE9. I like to learn by more than one teacher (team)	4%	42%	54%
LE10. I like to solve problems in different ways (creative problem solving)	5%	42%	53%
LE11. I like learning by using pre/post testing(ind. study)	23%	52%	31%
LE12. I like learning ways to make the best use of my time for school tasks (study skills/time manage)	16%	57%	27%
LE13. I like reading for interpretation and not just comprehension	14%	57%	29%
LE14. I like using techniques that make me think (daily problems, debates etc.)	7%	40%	53%
LE15. I like having the same team of teachers for more than one year	8%	32%	60%
LE16. I like working in a class of equal intelligent students	3%	31%	66%
LE17. I like being a leader in classroom activities	9%	47%	43%

LE18. I like the open classroom setting	1%	24%	75%
LE19. I like being with the same students more than one yr.	2%	35%	63%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

Answer the following questions regarding the gifted program:

	Not At All	Some	A Great Deal
PD1. We learn mainly from the textbook.	14%	83%	3%
PD2. We explore broad ideas or complex problems.	1%	47%	53%
PD3 We seek information by using a variety of sources.	1%	27%	72%
PD4. We study what I have already learned in previous classes or elsewhere.	21%	74%	5%
PD5. We are challenged with new ideas.	0%	28%	72%
PD6. All students in the class are studying the same thing.	1%	46%	52%
PD7. We are asked questions that have only one right answer.	10%	84%	6%
PD8. We have to think through a problem and reason for ourselves.	1%	47%	52%
PD9. We listen to a lecture or explanation by the teacher for much of the time in class.	16%	64%	21%
PD10. We are involved in group discussions or projects during class.	1%	39%	60%
PD11. We spend most of our time memorizing facts.	46%	52%	2%
PD12. We have assignments completely determined by the teacher.	10%	64%	26%
PD13. We are involved as students in the evaluation of our work	6%	69%	25%

	Not at All	Some	A Great Deal
PD14. We share our major products with others outside our classroom.	28%	58%	14%

COMPONENT: IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I1. What do you think of the term gifted?

___13%___ It is a problem for me a great deal of the time.
___39%___ It was a problem at first but isn't anymore.
___48%___ It has never been a problem for me.

COMPONENT: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSITION

L1. Concerning the transition from the regular classroom to the gifted program, I felt

___26%___ well prepared and the change was smooth.
___61%___ somewhat prepared and the change was smooth.
___13%___ not prepared and the change wasn't smooth.

L2a. Concerning the transition from the elementary part of the program to that of the middle school, I felt that *

___35%___ the change was smooth.
___37%___ the change was okay.
___ 4%___ the change was unsatisfactory.
___24%___ the change does not apply to me.

* answers from grades 6-8 only.

Student Survey A Comments

P28. Please describe how you felt toward school both before entering the gifted program and after being a part of it.

Before: stupid (1) , bored (12), too easy (2), didn't like school (8), scared/nervous (8), had to act less smart to fit in (1), didn't learn as much (1), wasn't fun (2), learned same thing over and over (1), too much busy work/homework (1) dreaded school (1), no difference (2)

After: easier/more fun (4), more on my level (3), like school more now (11), more challenging (14), felt better (6), have to think more now (1), people like me more here (1), proud (1), more hands-on learning (1), can't wait to come (1), harder (1), new material to study (1), working together as groups (1), dread the end of it (1), more secure here (1)

P29 Please describe how you feel about students who are a part of the program and those students who are not a part of the program.

Part of Program: fun/challenging people (9), students more organized (1), students are happier (1), pay attention to me when I'm talking (1), make me feel smarter (1), nice to be with equals (1), some are not nice (2),

Not Part of Program: call us names (2), are having trouble with school(1) make fun of us (2), think it's harder in the program (2), loss of former friends (2), feel sorry that they are missing out on the program (2), aren't as organized (1), don't really listen to me (1) are difft. than me in interests (1),

*** feel the same about all students program or not (19)
*** all should be treated with the same respect (4)

P30. Please share what has been the most satisfactory experience for you.

plays (1), learning Spanish (2), SAT's achievement tests (1), being with one's equals and not waiting for others to catch up (3), simulations (25) - Discovery 2 (6) and Amigos (1); group projects (1), projects (1), experiments (1), field trips (2), getting good grades (3), meeting other students (3), musical instrument construction (2), all the challenging things we do (6), changing to a new school (1), Social Studies (1), Alpha Beta Unit (5). 98

P31. Please share what has been the least satisfactory experience for you.

Discovery 2 group (1), beginning of the year (4), substitutes (1), invention unit (2), Jr. Great Books (2), 1st time to be with a grade difference in the same room (1), some students (5), nothing (3), homework (1), bad grades (1), changing schools/leaving friends (6), getting home later (2), health (2), "love notes" (1), sound unit-science (1), learning by text (4), family tree project (2), making new friends (1), reading (2), taking tests (1), being in a reg. classroom (1), Challenge U. unit (1), Wars Unit (1), left out of bldg. things (1), ind. study in math (1), science readings (1), Color Unit (1), reports (1), Geometry Unit (1)

What do we need to be doing more of?

student chosen groups (3), student decisions on "how to work on things" (1), field trips (6), nothing (10), activities/hands-on (6), simulations (13), group work (1), projects (1), plays (1), experiments (5) ind. work (1), teachers' way of presenting material (1), health (1), science (1), lang. (1), computers (1), homework (1), crafts (1). discipline (1), helping others outside the program to remember we are students first and gifted second (1), discuss what we think of things we study more (1)

What do we need to be doing less of ?

nothing (9), substitute teachers (1), textbook work (9) - 3 wks. not 6 wks. transition period (4); taking notes (2), ind. projects (2), written reports (2), presentations (1), homework when we have other projects (3), short reports should be longer (1), Jr. Grt. Bks. (4) worksheets (2), picking our own groups (1), (old) filmstrips (3) and (old) VCR's (1), less expectations on projects (1), tests (2), recess (1), ind. study (1), science (1)

What do we need to continue to do?

keep class under control (1), simulations (23), teaching in fun ways (4) keeping 4th & 5th in one classroom (2), everything (4), picking our own groups (1), field trips (2), projects (partner/others) (4), brain-storming (1), using games that teach (1), hands-on activities (4), keeping class interesting (1), keep homework the same (1), continue to challenge us (1), social studies (1)

What new or additional things would you like to see added to our gifted program?

let others decide (1), nothing (17), more field trips (6), more simulations (4) - science & lang. simulations ie. voyage to another planet (2), more equipment (2), spelling bees (1), flexible times for recess ie. not 2-3 days and then all day (1), more about colonization (1), new videos, materials and bks. (2), student teachers for the ele. gifted program too (2), more about presidents (1), student selected projects (Ind.) (2), more foreign lang. (1), students who can get along with those who are different (1), more computers (1), activities (1)

Student Survey (B)
(29 responses)

Please indicate the month/year that you entered and exited the gifted program. From 8/85 to 6/92.

COMPONENT: IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

18. The labeling of the term gifted was

__19%__ a problem for me a great deal of the time.
__48%__ a problem for me some of the time.
__33%__ not a problem for me.

COMPONENT: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSITION

Please rank your preference in the way material was taught in the program, with number 1 being your first choice and number 7 being your least favorite way to learn:

__6__ (5.79) lecture (someone tells you about it)
__7__ (6.51) read material and answer questions
__1__ (1.68) simulations (learning while pretending
__2__ (2.72) laboratory (experiments)
__3__ (3.10) cooperative group work
__5__ (4.37) independent study (learning on your own)
__4__ (3.82) audio visual use (filmstrips, VCR's, overheads etc.)

Please indicate by an "x" areas you felt were positive while in the gifted program:

__70%__ interdisciplinary approaches (where subject areas overlap)
__56%__ teachers working as a team to teach material
__81%__ use of creative problem solving techniques (not one way to solve a problem)
__30%__ use of independent/individualized studies (pre/post testing)
__30%__ use of study skills, time management techniques for organization
__41%__ use of interpretative reading and not just reading for comprehension
__93%__ use of techniques to make you think (daily problems, debates, etc.)
__41%__ having the same team of teachers more than one year
__70%__ working with a class of equal intelligent students
__74%__ having leadership opportunities in the class
__70%__ open classroom (physical setting)
__52%__ a sense of family/community within the group

Directions: Please indicate the extent of your agreement to each of the following items. Please circle one reply only.

1 = no opinion
2 = not at all
3 = to some extent
4 = to a considerable extent
5 = to a great extent

COMPONENT: LEARNING TRANSITION

LT1. I felt prepared for the elementary gifted program:

1 = 23% 2 = 4% 3 = 23% 4 = 35% 5 = 15%

LT2. The transition from the regular classroom to the gifted program was smooth:

1 = 7% 2 = 19% 3 = 15% 4 = 37% 5 = 22%

LT3. I felt prepared for the middle school gifted program:

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 26% 4 = 22% 5 = 48%

LT4. The transition from the elementary program to the middle school program was smooth:

1 = 11% 2 = 8% 3 = 12% 4 = 31% 5 = 38%

LT5. I felt well prepared for high school:

1 = 0% 2 = 4% 3 = 15% 4 = 33% 5 = 48%

LT6. The transition from the middle school program to the high school was smooth:

1 = 4% 2 = 7% 3 = 30% 4 = 37% 5 = 22%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD19. The program's goals of preparing students for the future is reflected in the total program:

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 46% 4 = 35% 5 = 19%

PD32. My academic needs were met in the gifted program:

1 = 0% 2 = 4% 3 = 37% 4 = 44% 5 = 15%

PD37. Reflecting on multiple years of instruction with the same group of teachers was a benefit to me (having the same teacher for the same subject area for more than one year.)

1 = 7% 2 = 26% 3 = 22% 4 = 26% 5 = 19%

PD38. Having the same team of teachers for more than one year was a benefit to me (working with the same team of teachers for more than one year):

1 = 7% 2 = 31% 3 = 23% 4 = 12% 5 = 27%

In high school, the honor classes and advanced placement classes met my academic needs:

1 = 7% 2 = 4% 3 = 19% 4 = 26% 5 = 44%

In high school, I felt that my teachers knew that I was part of the gifted program:

1 = 0% 2 = 27% 3 = 15% 4 = 43% 5 = 15%

Open-Ended Questions:

How did the program impact you academically, socially, goal setting and with your self concept?

Academically - 14 students referred to the academic gains from participation in the program. Examples of comments: " Academically it made me want to achieve." "Academically taught me a great deal and strengthened old concepts." "It helped me feel more confident in my academic abilities."

Socially - 9 students referred to social isolation as participants in the program. Comments: "I loved the gifted program except for the social aspects." "Socially, it alienated me." "It keeps kids isolated from interacting with others." "Socially (in retrospect) I was limited to interact mainly with those in the program." " I was able to learn along with a small group and grow together with them." "I developed a close group of friends."

Goal Setting - 7 students referred to goal setting effects of the program. Comments: "I really enjoyed the challenges the program offered as well as the goal setting techniques." "It helped me with goal setting and self concept." "While learning, I made many close friends who had the same goals as I. It worked out very well." "It helped me set my goals higher."

Self Concept - 4 students mentioned the self-concept impact of the program. Examples of comments: "It helped me feel more confident in every way." "It helped me in every area." "It helped me with goal setting and self concept."

If you had the opportunity to do it all over again, would you participate in the gifted program? Why or why not?

All but four students answered yes. Reasons these four indicated they would not follows: "I felt that I have not been able to be accepted socially." "Because I would have had more friends if I was not in the program." "I feel I could have gotten the same education in Level I classes." "I felt left out socially."

Reasons students indicated that they would participate again if the opportunity arose included: "I feel that I'm well prepared for the classes that I'm taking now." "If I knew the outcome would be the same, I would be willing to endure the included difficulties." "It was fun yet educational at the same time." "It was an exciting academic experience." "The benefits gained by working in an interactive environment are very beneficial in the long run." "I like the way it combines subjects, groups and teaching." "I learned a great deal." "It was a great experience." "Definitely. I had a lot of fun while learning a lot academically and a lot about myself." "The teahers were excellent!" "I gained a lot due to the program's focus on creativity." "Being with the same classmates took the nervousness away from meeting all new people each year and helped me create a more relaxed atmosphere." "I made some really good friends and everyone was very close."

Only two students indicated that they would only participate in part of the five year program. Comments: "Yes, but probably not after elementary school, because of the adjustment to high school." "Not in the middle school when high school came around most of the "A" students in Honor Algebra weren't in the program."

P28. Please describe your attitude toward school both before entering the gifted program and after being part of it. Please indicate what you found to be the most and least satisfactory experiences.

Most satisfactory experiences included: the stimulating, academic atmosphere; the simulations; the challenging curriculum; the science program; the teachers; Young Author's; the ele. part of the program; I could act myself; group work; the sense of accomplishment; becoming more organized; producing something new and creative on my own; how to work with others; and give me some useful & I'm much more happy.

Least satisfactory experiences mentioned: readjusting socially in high school; disliked multiculturalism present in history courses; disliked school (pre-college) it was too structured again; before the program I was bored with busy work; curriculum being different; & before - my studying was disorganized and sporadic.

P29. Please list below extra-curricular and community activities in which you have been involved both during the program and after it.

The following categories were listed and the frequency amounts:

Sports (14)	Music (13)
Aca. Clubs (12)	Volunteers (10)
Peer Helper (9)	Leadership (9)
Hon. Society (9)	Class Coun. (6)
OM (6)	Yr. Bk./Newp.(6)
Drama (4)	Church Grp (4)
Govt. (3)	Chess (2)

What do we need to be doing more of?

simulations (3); integrating with other students outside the program (3); grammar (2); field trips (2); math (2); science; computer skills; up to date texts; teaching each other; group projects; & better social preparation.

What do we need to be doing less of?

long term group work (3); social isolation (2); labeling (2); homework; book-type assignments; more variety in teaching approaches; comparing abilities of students; "less curriculum that emphasizes the differences between blacks and whites - We're all Americans."

What do we need to continue to do?

simulations (5); group work (5); interdisciplinary teaching (3); writing stories (2); interactive learning (2); science/math curriculum; Young Authors; brain stimulating activities; "Make students believe that they can achieve high goals." "Talking to students one-to-one about their achievements." "Teaching - I learned so much from some of the teachers." "I am ahead of my college peers in the ability to answer essay questions and analyses." "We can not ignore challenging the top students and only elevate the bottom students." "Definitely continue group projects. They taught me how to work well with others & divide responsibilties." "Actually doing things instead of just reading about them." "I liked that we didn't do much book work. That was probably the biggest transition when leaving the program."

What new or additional things would you like to see added to our gifted program?

"Big trips for kids in the Middle School. I really missed those." "Nothing!" "New textbooks, more interaction with teachers & students outside the program (maybe exchange classes for a wk.) or bring a friend into the program to show them that gifted students don't fit the stereotype, less isolation." "More interaction with students outside the program." "Better learning materials." "Put the sound, light, and energy unit back in 6th grade science." "A more liberal approach - it seemed so conservative, a variety would have been nice." "More advanced work in the main subject areas." "More opportunities for 'gifted' students to do things with the 'regular' students." "Preparing students socially for the high school atmosphere." "Career Exploration." "More staff - a varied teaching approach, I exhausted the patience of some of the M. school teachers. More speakers and outside sources, more hands-on equipment, more areas of exploration like art, music and drama." "Able to interact more with those on different intellectual levels." "More chances for leadership."

Student Survey (C)
(30 responses)

Please indicate the month/year that you entered and exited the gifted program. From 8/80 to 6/89.

COMPONENT. IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I8 The labeling of the term gifted was

__17%__ a problem for me a great deal of the time.
__45%__ a problem for me some of the time.
__50%__ not a problem for me.

COMPONENT: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSITION

Please rank your preference in the way material was taught in the program, with number 1 being your first choice and number 7 being your least favorite way to learn:

__6__ (5.24) lecture (someone tells you about it)
__7__ (5.89) read material and answer questions
__1__ (2.55) simulations (learning while pretending
__3__ (2.82) laboratory (experiments)
__2__ (2.75) cooperative group work
__4__ (3.72) independent study (learning on your own)
__5__ (4.44) audio visual use (filmstrips, VCR's, overheads etc.)

Please indicate by an "x" areas you felt were positive while in the gifted program.

__69%__ interdisciplinary approaches (where subject areas overlap)
__76%__ teachers working as a team to teach material
__83%__ use of creative problem solving techniques (not one way to solve a problem)
__31%__ use of independent/individualized studies (pre/post testing)
__28%__ use of study skills, time management techniques for organization
__38%__ use of interpretative reading and not just reading for comprehension
__83%__ use of techniques to make you think (daily problems, debates, etc.)
__83%__ having the same team of teachers more than one year
__86%__ working with a class of equal intelligent students
__55%__ having leadership opportunities in the class
__69%__ open classroom (physical setting)
__59%__ a sense of family/community within the group

Directions: Please indicate the extent of your agreement to each of the following items. Please circle one reply only.

1 = no opinion
2 = not at all
3 = to some extent
4 = to a considerable extent
5 = to a great extent

COMPONENT: LEARNING TRANSITION

LT1. I felt prepared for the elementary gifted program:

1 = 18% 2 = 4% 3 = 11% 4 = 30% 5 = 37%

LT2. The transition from the regular classroom to the gifted program was smooth:

1 = 7% 2 = 3% 3 = 31% 4 = 34% 5 = 25%

LT3. I felt prepared for the middle school gifted program:

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 10% 4 = 31% 5 = 59%

LT4. The transition from the elementary program to the middle school program was smooth:

1 = 11% 2 = 7% 3 = 11% 4 = 37% 5 = 34%

LT5. I felt well prepared for high school:

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 7% 4 = 21% 5 = 72%

LT6. The transition from the middle school program to the high school was smooth:

1 = 4% 2 = 24% 3 = 24% 4 = 24% 5 = 24%

LT7. I felt well prepared for post high school:

1 = 0% 2 = 4% 3 = 11% 4 = 14% 5 = 71%

LT8. The transition from high school to post high school was smooth:

1 = 4% 2 = 10% 3 = 0% 4 = 34% 5 = 52%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD19. The program's goals of preparing students for the future is reflected in the total program:

1 = 4% 2 = 4% 3 = 21% 4 = 46% 5 = 25%

PD32. My academic needs were met in the gifted program:

1 = 0% 2 = 3% 3 = 14% 4 = 17% 5 = 66%

PD37. Reflecting on multiple years of instruction with the same group of teachers was a benefit to me (having the same teacher for the same subject area for more than one year.)

1 = 0% 2 = 6% 3 = 28% 4 = 21% 5 = 45%

PD38. Having the same team of teachers for more than one year was a benefit to me (working with the same team of teachers for more than one year):

1 = 3% 2 = 10% 3 = 21% 4 =24% 5 = 42%

In high school, the honor classes and advanced placement classes met my academic needs:

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 29% 4 = 32% 5 = 39%

In high school, I felt that my teachers knew that I was part of the gifted program:

1 = 17% 2 = 28% 3 = 35% 4 = 10% 5 = 10%

How did the program impact you academically, socially, goal setting and with your self-concept?

Academically - 17 students referred to the academic gains from participation in the program. Examples of comments: "Being around a group of intelligent students (those who applied themselves) made me work harder, and not take the easy way." "Academically it satisfied my creative and intellectual needs and desires." "The program made me more academically inclined as well as improved my confidence in my abilities." "Academically - wonderful program; excited to learn and the ability to work in groups."

Socially - 8 students expressed the positive feelings of the multi-year advantage of being with their equals for the extended time that the program provided. 7 student referred to social isolation as participants in the program. Example of comments: "I also improved my social skills." "Helped me make some of the best friends." "I wasn't exposed to peers outside the program." "I loved it being with the same group of for 5 yrs.; we all grew as a family and we're still close." "TAG make school enjoyable. I finally made friends I still have; it helped a lot!" "Socially to a lesser extent."

Goal Setting - 10 students referred to the goal setting effects of the program in a favorable way. Examples of responses: "Prepared me for life after high school." "I became excited to learn and do my best." "I set higher goals for myself." "Academically and goal setting = Great!"

Self-concept - 9 students mentioned the self-concept impact of program. Comments included: "It impacted me nicely with a blue hue." "It made me feel good about myself." "The program made me more academically inclined as well as improved my confidence in my abilities." "I found myself more disciplined than many of my classmates in high school and consequently in college." "Much more self-aware after the program."

If you had the opportunity to do it all over again, would you participate in the gifted program? Why or why not?

All but four post high school students indicated that they would participate in the gifted program again. The no respondents indicated that it was too difficult to readjust to a "non-creative" high school educational life and consequently one completed their high school requirements as a home study participant. Social isolation was also a reason that they would choose not to participate again.

Reasons students indicated that they would participate again if the opportunity arose included: "It made me more independent and a better leader. I don't think that I would have been so motivated to do well if I would have remained in the regular classroom, where I was usually bored with school."

"The best years of school were spent in the program." "It improved my critical thinking skills quite a bit and provided opportunities for me that are not readily available for those not in the program." "It taught me about teamwork and challenged me individually to strive beyond standard goals." "I am what I am because of who I have met, what I have done, and what I thought about both of these things. It enveloped my for 5-9 years." "I loved the projects and the group activities." "Friendships still remain today. The biggest impact was academic - the creativity we were allowed/permitted to pursue truly enhanced my experience. Unfortunately, this died when I entered high school." "Yes, because of the excellent education - I'm able to attend college on a full scholarship." "The gifted program and honor classes did a great deal of teaching beyond academic areas. I learned to work in groups and take a leadership role and set personal goals for myself." "Great chances to bring out personality and work with others with similar interests. But, sometimes found it hard to relate to others." "It developed a new way of thinking and problem solving for me to use the rest of my life. It also gave me a great set of teachers. However, it spoiled me - high school definitely did not. I was used to wonderful teachers and in high school they weren't as helpful." "My years in TAG were the only school years I enjoyed. I developed socially (being with the same group for so long)." "It kept me from taking the easy way out. I wanted to take the hardest classes and learn as much as I could." "For the best, it taught me to recognize and apply my abilities." "It gave me the critical thinking skills that paved the way for my success in high school and post. It greatly benefited my writing ability." "It allowed me to strive for and reach higher goals than otherwise would have been possible. It was a great source of self-confidence when approaching academics & faced with any kind of challenge." "Oh yes! Had I not had the program, I would not have become who I am today. I believe that I would have been satisfied with far less." "It demonstrated that I do better and feel better when I'm intellectually challenged. When my creative outlets are stifled, I lose interest in succeeding." "It gave me faith in my intelligence but unrealistic expectations of others." "Yes, I now know the answers to the exams. I could take them faster and get on with the real learning."

P28. Please describe your attitude toward school both before entering the gifted program and after being part of it. Please include what you found to be the most and least satisfactory experiences.

Before - "I liked school but wasn't challenged." "No creative outlet; nothing common with less motivated students." " Bored, hated school and felt confined." "Apathetic - surprised to be considered gifted." "School was just part of life." 111

After - "After 4th/5th grade, loved school." "Understanding of my abilities, as well as those of others." "I felt I had been part of an elite group of friends." "More comfortable with self." "Teachers assumed I didn't need things to be explained. In TAG, everything could be asked and explained. There wasn't such a thing as a stupid question. After TAG, the world wasn't quite so friendly." "I knew I could succeed, express, interact, learn and lead."

Most satisfactory experiences included: a sense of accomplishing any goal set; becoming focused on academics; cohension built by taking classes with the same friends over the years; many opportunities to be creative & free thinking; & the encouragement of individualized, creative thought. "I could look at challenges and no longer cringe "

Least satisfactory experiences included: changing environments by changing schools; separation from the "family" atmosphere present in the program. "There wasn't anything unsatisfactory."

P29. Please list below extra-curricular and community activities in which you have been involved both during the program and after it.

The following categories were listed and the frequency amounts:

Sports (22)	Clubs (14)
commun. serv. (13)	Music (12)
Frat./Sor. (9)	Honor Soc.(9)
Govt. (8)	Newsp/Yr.Bk (7)
Drama (7)	Church (6)
Peer Counselor (6)	Cheerldr. (6)
class council (5)	job (4)
dance (4)	scouts (3)

Please list you present occupation and title: student (19); insurance agent/acct. representative; auditor; chemist - research associate; president & electrical engineer; staff nurse; law school; art / math education; ele./ special ed; pharmacy intern; preschool teacher; deputy sheriff; finance major; publisher's representative; cadet at U.S. Military Academy; cadet at U.S. Naval Academy; chemical engineer - resident asst.; admissions asst. coordinator; & graduate student.

What are your goals or what do you still hope to do?

additional schooling (13); teach secondary math, travel(3), CPA certificate; law school (3); teach or coach nutrition/fitness; advance at my company; make the world a better/more fun place; nursing anethestist; practice law and impact this community positively; S.S. degree; "Teach children what art is and give them the tools to express themselves creatively." "To provide other students with the type of education I received." to become an actuary; music educator - arranger or performing owning a production/publ. Co.; become an RN; raise my family; game warden; become a judge; major in French - teach h. school & direct h.s. plays/musicals; owning my own business; receiving commission in the U.S. Navy; will enter the business world or public service if Army proves less than satisfactory; continuously evolve - achieve what I feel is important; become clinical psychologist; and "personal - reform our capitalist/consumer society."

What do we need to be doing more of?

Integration with other students (9); expand the program to include more students (4); independent studies (2); easing the stigma of being considered gifted among the rest of the student body; collaborative learning; "More transition between 8th and 9th grade - we were left hanging." "Do something for the artistically gifted student." "Team teaching and overlapping subjects." "The same things you've always done." "Following up after TAG and more re-evaluation during it. Push even harder, but stress well roundedness, long term goals and career planning." analytic/critical thinking; group projects; "Encourage creative learning above and beyond the classroom." "Affirming students as people; integrating with other students."

What do we need to be doing less of?

segregating (3); labeling (2); lecture-style classes (2); Comments: "Tests (2) - how about written evaluations? Nobody wants to be reduced to numbers and all you can tell from tests is how well people take tests." "Creative projects - some basic skills in English and Math were skipped." "No complaints." "Lecturing - because hands on is one of the best ways to learn." "There should be an ele. program in each bldg. to avoid busing ordeal." "Pushing the class to be #1 gifted student - let everyone be themselves." "I didn't like having the same teachers for three years (personality conflict)." "Constricting students to a restrictive agenda & also need to help students explicitly deal with their special social situation."

What do we need to continue to do?

group projects (6); creative and critical thinking opportunities (4); keeping great teachers (3); simulations (3); team teaching (2); stimulating students to learn in unique ways (2); challenge students intellectually; book reports; "Continue exposing the students to advanced material to challenge them intellectually." "Everything." "Keep up all different ways of learning - I still remember Ad Agency and Gallion." "The simulations in 4th/5th grade like Alpha/Beta, the personal career research paper and projects on Egypt with the different levels to cover." "Keep Science Day." "Stimulate creativity/critical thinking at all costs through all channels." "Time management through self-discipline." "Offer students a safe place to explore and expand the depths of their minds." "Build a sense of community & create the desire to learn through group projects and simulations."

What new or additional things would you like to see added to our gifted program?

"Add foreign language program and computer curriculum." "Continue the group sessions, special projects, special field trips & challenging new 'pretend' projects like Alpha/Beta." "Career-oriented events, preparations for college years, career - world, high school etc." "If possible, community-oriented projects for performance based & authentic assessment, rather than traditional assessment." "A program for artistically gifted - nurture the artist." "Gifted students tutoring other students - will improve self-esteem." "Don't alienate gifted students, more interaction with others." "Foreign language for grades 4-5 and more independent reading." "More teachers, classes, classrooms and computers." "Career learning program so students can see what's out there before college." "An Alumni Newsletter. I have largely lost touch with my classmates, although the times I spent in TAG are among my fondest memories. There is definitely a very strong kinship between those of us in the program." "Outside visitors and trips to plants. Art and humanity appreciation (this coming from an engineer??)" "A high school program." "Computer learning; maybe working with developing disabled kids sometimes."

Appendix E

Parent Surveys

(Present and Past)

Parent Survey "A" Results
(59 responded)

Please examine the items below and base your responses on the result of your child's participation in the gifted program. Rate the following items that best describes your child before entering the gifted program and after being part of the program. Please use "B" to indicate before entering the VISIONS Program and "A" to indicate after being part of the VISIONS Program.

	NOT AT ALL		SOME		A GREAT DEAL	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)
P1. Likes school.	0%	0%	22%	32%	78%	68%
P2. Sticks to a project once it is started.	0%	5%	38%	46%	62%	49%
P3. Is observant.	2%	2%	14%	21%	84%	77%
P4. Has lots of ideas to share.	2%	3%	17%	39%	81%	58%
P5. Has many different ways of solving problems.	2%	5%	32%	59%	66%	36%
P6. Is aware of problems others do not see.	3%	5%	43%	48%	54%	47%
P7 Uses unique and unusual ways of solving problems.	2%	7%	32%	54%	66%	39%
P8. Wants to know how and why.	0%	0%	16%	25%	84%	75%
P9. Other children call him/her to initiate play activities.	15%	9%	46%	47%	39%	44%
P10. Asks a lot of questions about a variety of subjects.	4%	2%	19%	31%	77%	67%
P11. Is concerned with details.	5%	4%	25%	39%	70%	57%
P12. Enjoys and responds to beauty.	2%	2%	58%	58%	40%	40%
P13. Is able to plan and organize activities.	5%	7%	31%	45%	64%	48%
P14. Has above average coordination agility, and ability in organized games.	16%	16%	42%	49%	42%	35%
P15. Often finds and corrects own mistakes.	7%	12%	54%	61%	39%	27%
P16. Others seem to enjoy his/her company.	3%	2%	37%	44%	60%	54%
P17. Makes up stories and has ideas that are unique.	6%	6%	14%	30%	80%	64%

	NOT AT ALL		SOME		A GREAT DEAL	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)
P18. Has a wide range of interests.	2%	2%	23%	32%	75%	66%
P19. Gets other children to do what he/she wants.	9%	2%	60%	58%	31%	40%
P20. Likes to play organized games and is good at them.	14%	18%	36%	36%	50%	46%
P21. Enjoys other people and seeks them out.	5%	10%	40%	46%	55%	44%
P22. Is able and willing to work with others.	2%	7%	28%	39%	70%	54%
P23. Sets high standards for self.	4%	7%	28%	30%	68%	63%
P24. Chooses difficult problems over simple ones.	10%	19%	52%	48%	38%	33%
P25. Is able to laugh at himself/herself (if necessary).	13%	18%	48%	53%	39%	29%
P26. Likes to do many things and participates wholeheartedly.	5%	5%	40%	40%	55%	55%
P27. Likes to have his/her ideas known.	2%	5%	21%	30%	77%	65%

COMPONENT: IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I1. Concerning my child's identification for the gifted program,

__87%__ I have been informed of the criteria.
__10%__ I have not been informed of the criteria.
__3%__ I was not informed.

I2. Concerning my child's placement in the gifted program,

__97%__ I was directly informed of this placement decision by school personnel (through a letter, conference, call etc.)
__3%__ I was indirectly informed through my child or non-school personnel.
__0%__ I was not informed.

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD28. My child has been exposed to various teaching methodologies within the gifted program (ie. lecture, simulations, cooperative learning, independent study etc.)

__52%__ to a great extent.
__40%__ on a regular basis.
__7%__ occasionally
__0%__ has not been used, to my knowledge.
__1%__ other.

PD31. Concerning the gifted program's intent to adapt the approved district curriculum in ways commensurate with the needs of the gifted

___47%___ my child's needs have been extensively met.
___38%___ my child's needs have been adequately met.
___12%___ my child's needs have been met somewhat.
____3%___ my child's needs have not been met.

PD32. The academic needs of my child have been

___47%___ extensively met.
___37%___ adequately met.
___13%___ somewhat met
____3%___ not been met.

COMPONENT: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSITION

LT1. Concerning my child's primary level preparation for the gifted program

__63%__ my child was well prepared.
__23%__ my child was adequately prepared.
__12%__ my child was somewhat prepared.
___0%___ my child was inadequately prepared.
___2%___ other.

LT4. Concerning the transition from the elementary part of the program to that of the middle school, I find that

___38%___ the transition was smooth.
___15%___ the transition was adequate.
____2%___ the transition was unsatisfactory.
___42%___ the transition did not apply to my child.
____2%___ other.

LT9. Concerning the goal of developing self-directed learners/independent workers and the management of one's own learning

___47%___ my child has increased in this area due to participation in the gifted program.
___49%___ my child has maintained in this area due to participation in the gifted program.
____2%___ my child has decreased in this area due to participation in the gifted program.
____2%___ other.

LT10. Concerning the facilities of the program (building, rooms, equipment, materials, and busing)

___19%___ the facilities are excellent.
___57%___ the facilities are adequate.
___10%___ the facilities are somewhat adequate.
___14%___ the facilities are inadequate.

COMPONENT: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

PAS1. Concerning information given me on the gifted program's procedures and policies, through parent conferences, teacher correspondence, newsletters, the parent handbook, or other means of communication

___77%___ I have been adequately informed.
____8%___ I have had opportunities to be informed, but have not participated.
___10%___ I have not been adequately informed.
____5%___ other.

PAS2. Concerning information given to be on my child's progress and involvement in the gifted program,

___80%___ I have been adequately informed.
____3%___ I have had had opportunities to be informed, but have not participated.
___10%___ I have had not any communication from school personnel relating to my child's progress.
____7&___ other.

PAS3. Concerning your support for the program as a parent,

___56%___ I strongly support the program.
___23%___ I support the program with some reservations.
___13%___ I support the idea of a program, but have many reservations about its implementation in our system.
____3%___ other.

PAS4. Concerning district level administrative support (funding, coordinator services, student support, etc.) of the program

___26%___ support exists at a high level.
___48%___ support exists at a adequate level.
___12%___ support exists at a minimal level.
____7%___ no support is evident.
____7%___ other.

PAS5. Concerning building level administrative support (appropriate scheduling, provision of resources, student support, etc.) of the program

___28%___ support exists at a high level.
___50%___ support exists at an adequate level.
___10%___ support exists at a minimal level.
____7%___ no support is evident.
____5%___ other.

Parent Survey (A)
Comments

L10. Concerning the facilities of the program (building, rooms, equipment, materials, and busing) [25/75 responded]

small rooms (8); little technology, need more computers video, laser disks, & networking (5); busing is not adequate (too long a ride, too overcrowded) (5); science learning - need more labs and hands-on experiments (3); the facilities are excellent and so are the teachers (2); one room with 50 children is not acceptable (2); middle school students isolated from the peers (2); middle school doesn't offer quiet classrooms (2); ele. students are made to feel unwanted by comments of other teachers ; ele. teachers are being hindered by the school administration and other teachers; no open classrooms - poor.

PAS3. Concerning your support for the program as a parent, I support the idea of a program, but have several reservations about its implementation to our system [16/75 responded]

mix more with other grade classes (5); having the same teachers for 2+yrs. (3); integration with community and school more (2); need more active learning; need more field trips; need more than lecture in math & science; teachers need to notify students of missing homework before contacting parents; quickly covering subject & expected to retain for later testing; others not in program treatment as elitists; English basics; mix students up more in larger groups and for better social relations; 50 students in one room is high stress for child; standard improvement in education program; teachers treatment of students not equal; some material is outdated; teachers grammatical errors (orally & written); teachers sharing personal life with students.

What do we need to be doing more of?
[59/75 responded]

VISIONS students less segregated from other students (8); basic grammar (6); spelling (6); hiring professionals for career ed. (5); emphasize the basics (5); computer technology (4); study skills stressed (4); teachers communicate more with parents (4); more writing (3); promoting self-esteem (3); parent training/meetings (3); other Fairfield teaching staff's attitude (to be more positive) (3); extend science lab (3); honor classes for more students that excel 1-2 subjects (3); students encouraged to be part of extra curricular activities (3); sentence structure (3); elementary math (3); cooperation (3); field trips (2); team working (students) (2); library and reference research (2); teachers taking individually with students (2); eliminate VISIONS elitist attitude (2); teaching students to get along with each other (2); VISIONS newsletter (2); more creativity (artistic) (2); more simulations (2); homework and curriculum; leadership training; reading good literature; community involvement; teachers hearing the parents' needs; teachers more flexible and responsive; cultural literacy; tests to come home; foreign language earlier; increase intellectual challenge; more hands-on; anti-drug program; more individualized instruction; more moral teaching; do not hold back - promote elitism; health and science - incorporate a variety of learning methods; let kids have fun together; socialization skills; vocabulary; evaluate the teachers in the program; direct supervision of the program; class size; and economics.

What do we need to be doing less of?
[28/75 responded]

"programmed work" - do more individualized work (3); taking trips (out of town) (2); too much due at the same time (2); lectures (2); busing different for some VISIONS students (drop off/pick up); channel 1; mainlining; protect them more; treat students as equals - no pets; worksheets - unless adequate instruction has been provided; sex ed - parents' job; emphasis on child being smart - leads to feeling of superiority; filmstrips; demeaning ways to compare less gifted kids vs. kids that shine in every subject; disregarding teacher's recommendation for selection for VISIONS; projects that take time away from basic math and English; teachers rambling

on and getting off track; update material; emphasis of sports; reconsider structure of 6-8 program; listening to parents who want a 'personalized' program; keeping them isolated; science fair criteria that only 'superior' projects will be accepted; placing stress on student/parents; parents not understanding directions on some assignments; group activities where a few carry the many; some activity days are too undirected; too much concern on curriculum and not enough on the development of the child socially; snide comments made by teachers; simulations; and competition instead of cooperation.

What do we need to continue to do?
[51/75 responded]

staying away from working along - do group work (11); projects (9); simulations and practical applications (8); integrate learning through subject fields (5); cooperative learning (5); students develop great organization skills (5); field trips (5); hiring dedicated teachers who appreciate the differences of the gifted and pay them well (4); challenging them (4); team teaching (4); as now - plus homework and reading at home (3); written expression (need more at middle school level) (3); math and science (3); research and investigations (2); good communication between home & school (2); providing some 'extra' things above & beyond middle-of-the-road curriculum (2) following the class direction of the discussion (2); science fair (2); what you're doing now (2); sharing research (2); using a wide variety of sources; staying away from worksheets and busy work; hands-on; encouraging to think & have opinions; weekly problems; the loose atmosphere of the elementary program; continue to offer this program at the elementary level; enrichment at 1st-3rd grade levels; add more classes as student population increases; better transition into high school; independent thinking; vocabulary; encourage creativity; science activity days; encourage students with special needs; students using multiple audio-visuals for presentations; high standards of achievement; advance them; not tolerating teasing; making learning fun; giving praise; developing individual workers; and encourage extra-curriculars.

What new or additional components would you like to see added to our gifted program? [47/75 responded]

computer-related activities (11); more students participating and expansion of the program (4); more field trips (3); art work (3); more hands-on (3); open door policy at middle school (3); bring back class trip (ele.) (2); typing (2); innovative programs (2); more simulations (2); more music (2); better connection with the rest of the school (2); trips to the university (2); Fairfield's program is the best we've found; more independent study; more fundamental approach to study skills; a little more guidance; class size; more insight to applications of what they're learning; more science lab equipment; a math/science progression that indicates these as a method of problem solving applicable to all fields; direct supervision of program; foreign languages; a better library; speakers, films etc.; reading as a part of the 7th/8th grade program; more interpretative reading; more written expression; more advanced work at 8th grade level - beyond level 1; continue the program for other students; address peer pressure, emphasize they're okay; cable interactive library; 6th graders not on 8th grade floor; listen to what parents say (teachers); speech/drama; computers need modems to bulletin boards; separate elementary class from 50/room; promote the uniqueness in students; tolerance by teachers that gifted kids are still kids; high level math; new ways of math thinking; more student video productions; use parents as mentors especially in math and science; laser disks; teacher evaluation; and give time for students to get to know one another at the beginning of the year.

Parent Survey "B" Results
(25 surveys returned)

COMPONENT: IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I1. When my child was identified for the gifted program, I had

___67%___ been informed of the criteria.
___33%___ not been informed of the criteria.

I2. Concerning my child's placement in the gifted program, I was

____96%____ directly informed of this placement decision by school personnel (through a letter, conference, call etc.).
_____4%____ indirectly informed through my child or non-school personnel.
_____0%_____ not informed.

Directions: Please indicate the extent of your agreement to each of the following items. Please circle one reply only.

1 = no opinion.
2 = not at all.
3 = to some extent.
4 = to a considerable extent.
5 = to a great extent.

I5. Policies of entry into and exit from the program were clearly stated and communicated

1 = 0% 2 = 8% 3 = 36% 4 = 44% 5 = 12%

I8. The perceived stigma attached to being identified as gifted and placed in the TAG program was a problem for my child

1 = 0% 2 = 24% 3 = 52% 4 = 8% 5 = 16%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD15. Continuity of services across grades K-12 is reflected in the total program

1 = 16% 2 = 12% 3 = 24% 4 = 36% 5 = 12%

PD16. Facilities and equipment available meets the program's instructional goals

1 = 4% 2 = 8% 3 = 28% 4 = 48% 5 = 12%

PD17. Overall, the program's impact on the total educational program in the schools is positive

1 = 0% 2 = 8% 3 = 24% 4 = 36% 5 = 32%

PD19. The program's goals of preparing students for the future is reflected in the total program

1 = 0% 2 = 4% 3 = 20% 4 = 52% 5 = 24%

PD28. My child was exposed to various teaching methodoligies within the gifted program (lecture, simulations etc.)

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 4% 4 = 60% 5 = 36%

PD29. The interdisciplinary approach of overlapping subject areas in thematic unit approaches was present in the gifted program

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 20% 4 = 44% 5 = 32%

PD30. The use of challenging topics chosen for teaching necessary concepts was present in the gifted program

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 16% 4 = 52% 5 = 32%

PD31. The gifted program's intent to adapt the approved district's curriculum in ways that commensurate the needs of the gifted occurs

1 = 4% 2 = 4% 3 =28% 4 = 48% 5 = 16%

PD32. The academic needs of my child were met

1 = 0% 2 = 4% 3 = 20% 4 = 40% 5 = 36%

PD33. The use of creative problem solving strategies and the opportunity for creativity in the gifted program occurred

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 16% 4 = 40% 5 = 44%

PD34. The use of individualized/independent study to meet students' area of giftedness was present

1 = 0% 2 = 16% 3 = 28% 4 = 24% 5 = 32%

PD35. A wide range of developmental skills, such as study skills and time management were present

1 = 4% 2 = 12% 3 = 36% 4 = 36% 5 = 12%

PD36. The use of higher level thinking skills occurred

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 28% 4 = 44% 5 = 28%

PD37. The academic instruction with teams of teachers over multiple years was a benefit for my child

1 = 4% 2 = 16% 3 = 32% 4 = 28% 5 = 20%

PD38. My child did benefit from having the same teachers for more than one year

1 = 8% 2 = 20% 3 = 32% 4 = 16% 5 = 24%

COMPONENT: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSITION

LE20. The sense of community present in the gifted program was felt by my child

1 = 8% 2 = 17% 3 = 29% 4 = 29% 5 = 17%

LE21. The group dynamics of working on many projects as a team was found by my child to be quite positive and challenging

1 = 0% 2 = 12% 3 = 36% 4 = 20% 5 = 32%

COMPONENT: LEARNING TRANSITION

LT1. My child was prepared for the elementary gifted program

1 = 8% 2 = 9% 3 = 22% 4 = 35% 5 = 26%

LT2. The transition from the regular classroom to the gifted program was smooth for my child

1 = 4% 2 = 20% 3 = 28% 4 = 24% 5 = 24%

LT3. My child was prepared for the middle school program

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 20% 4 = 28% 5 = 48%

LT4. The transition from the elementary program to the middle school program was smooth for my child

1 = 9% 2 = 4% 3 = 9% 4 = 23% 5 = 55%

LT5. My child was well prepared for high school

1 = 4% 2 = 4% 3 = 12% 4 = 28% 5 = 52%

LT6. The transition from the middle school program to the high school wa smooth for my child

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 8% 4 = 46% 5 = 42%

LT9. Concerning the goal of developing self-directed learners/independent workers and the management of one's own learning, my child increased in this area due to the participation in the gifted program

1 = 8% 2 = 0% 3 = 24% 4 = 32% 5 = 36%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

PAS3. Concerning your support for the program as a parent

___48%___ I strongly support the program.
___16%___ I support the program.
___24%___ I support the program with some reservations.
___12%___ I support the idea of the program, but have several reservations about its implementation to our system.

P28. Please describe your child's general attitude toward school, both before entering the gifted program and after being part of it. Please include what you found to be the most and least satisfactory experiences.

Before - "Always positive attitude about school." "Bored with regular school work and doing own projects during class." "Child was lazy before the program; it was too easy." "Apathetic." "Board with school and no challenged offered." "Students need to be taught how to work together."

After - "Attitude improved, probably because it was more challenging." " Busy & happy. This program saved my son's school experience and helped him enjoy learning." "Learned at a faster rate & on a higher level." "Gifted program challenged my child. He learned independent study habits and working in group projects." "Preparation for college excellent!" "The program was a God-send for my child. Once in the program she loved school. She was challenged and creativity was encouraged. Her teachers were first-rate, and she was in a class filled with achievers who supported and challenged each other." "The challenges of the program both socially and academically prepared him to be his own

person with his own interests and direction." "After the program - ele. - excited (fun simulations) and middle - okay (not as many simulations; a lot of lectures)." "Came to love school, especially group projects such as Alpha/Beta." "Group study projects and simulations were great teaching methods." "I appreciated not only the academic but social development of my child."

Most Satisfactory - "Interaction between the teachers and students and students to students." "Middle School Math." "Very pleased to become a part of the program and had a sense of pride." "Exposure to creative, dedicated teachers who broadened learning opportunities." "We felt the staff was excellent." "The overlapping subject areas." "I think all students should be given the opportunities to learn with the "TAG" approach " "The best experience was in the grade school level." "How much fun learning can be (simulations etc.) and bringing out creativity in students "

Least Satisfactory - "Clique formation." "Name calling 'TAG fag'." "Team projects where certain students rode the coattails of hard workers." "By the third year in Middle School program, our child was ready for new teachers/classmates." "No least satisfactory." "Not as good an experience in the Middle School - definitely labels child."

P29. Please list extra-curricular and community activities in which your child has been involved.

The following are the categories and the frequency mentioned:

Sports	(12)	Musical Groups	(10)
Academic clubs	(8)	Peer Helpers	(7)
Church activities	(7)	Honor Societies	(7)
Volunteer	(5)	Drama	(5)
Leadership	(5)	Govt.	(4)
Job	(4)	4-H & Scouts	(2)
Yr. Book	(2)	Class Council	(1)
Qtr. Horse Showing	(1)	OM	(1)
Chess	(1)		

What do we need to be doing more of?

Communicate and involve parents (4); identification and service expanded to include more students (3); reinforce study skills (3); computer usage (2); interaction with other students not in the program (2); interdisciplinary

units (3); simulations (2); field trips; career exploration; social adjustment preparation prior to 9th grade; leadership training; & evaluating programs Comments: "Increase communciation between parent/child/teacher. Most of these children haven't been challenged in 1st through 3rd grade and have not had to study. Time management skills and social adjustments were difficult." "Teach children how to adjust to the rejections of others through role playing and counseling." "Interdisciplinary units should include more math/science." "Evaluate criteria to accept children. Gifted children do not necessarily do well on standardized tests."

What do we need to be doing less of?

Segregating these students (2); group projects (2); having the same teachers for 3 yrs.(2); promoting arrogance; burn out at the end of 3 years (socially); & nothing. Comments: "A pull-out program is a fairer way to meet these student's needs plus more students would be served." "Extra long group assignments for the "group outcasts"; these were painful. Perhaps teacher appointed rather by student selection would eliminate the negatives." "Sometimes too much homework - need to have more class time for projects."

What do we need to continue to do?

Group projects (4); simulations (3); independent study (2); & integration of subjects (2) Comments: "Improving and changing program to be more dynamic and interactive - disciplinary at later grades." " Assist students in making them feel more comfortable about being gifted." "Encouraging children to learn, looking for their ind. talents." "Keep the program going. It is a public school alternate to private schools. It's a good defense against vouchers or similar." "Keep up challenges in the academic areas." "The educational part of the program was great; keep it going for the students." "Gifve students the opportunity to excel." "Continue creativity end of the program." "I'm a great supporter of the program in it's present form. Continue to challenge the students and instill a love of learning." "Group projects - a definite plus. Simulations were greatly enjoyed. Program feeds love for learning."

What new or additional components would you like to see added to our gifted program?

Counseling (2); reinforce basic English principles (2); more advanced computer classes; more field trips; & more interaction with others. Comments: "Arts, music, plays, outside problem solving (OM or something similar)." "Prepare students to be more understanding when re-entering mainstream & patience when working with others who need more time to complete a task." "Shift the math curriculum forward one yr. I would have preferred to have had some accelerated

(not just enhanced) instruction." "Gifted counselors or staff who can support our children's mental health." "A PTC type unit for parents of gifted students only. Include meetings over the summer before starting the program & monthly during the school year." "Fairfield offers an academic gifted program only. I'd like to see the scope broadened so others can be involved." "Students should be accepted in subject area(s) that they excell in and not necessarily for all classes. This would be possible in the middle school where there isn't as much interaction among subject areas."

Parent Survey "C" Results
(23 surveys returned)

COMPONENT. IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I1. When my child was identified for the gifted program, I had

___70%___ been informed of the criteria.
___30%___ not been informed of the criteria.

I2. Concerning my child's placement in the gifted program, I was

___100%___ directly informed of this placement decision by school personnel (through a letter, conference, call etc.).
_____0%_____ indirectly informed through my child or non-school personnel.
_____0%_____ not informed.

Directions: Please indicate the extent of your agreement to each of the following items. Please circle one reply only.

1 = no opinion.
2 = not at all
3 = to some extent.
4 = to a considerable extent.
5 = to a great extent

I5. Policies of entry into and exit from the program were clearly stated and communicated

1 = 5% 2 = 18% 3 = 32% 4 = 27% 5 = 18%

I8. The perceived stigma attached to being identified as gifted and placed in the TAG program was a problem for my child

1 = 0% 2 = 57% 3 = 30% 4 = 4% 5 = 9%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD15. Continuity of services across grades K-12 is reflected in the total program

1 = 18% 2 = 18% 3 = 50% 4 = 14% 5 = 0%

PD16. Facilities and equipment available meets the program's instructional goals

1 =23% 2 = 0% 3 = 27% 4 = 41% 5 = 9%

PD17. Overall, the program's impact on the total educational program in the schools is positive

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 26% 4 = 26% 5 = 44%

PD19. The program's goals of preparing students for the future is reflected in the total program

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 13% 4 = 43% 5 = 40%

PD28. My child was exposed to various teaching methodologies within the gifted program (lecture, simulations etc.)

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 4% 4 = 40% 5 = 52%

PD29. The interdisciplinary approach of overlapping subject areas in thematic unit approaches was present in the gifted program

1 = 0% 2 = 0% 3 = 26% 4 = 39% 5 = 35%

PD30. The use of challenging topics chosen for teaching necessary concepts was present in the gifted program

1 = 9% 2 = 0% 3 = 22% 4 = 39% 5 = 30%

PD31. The gifted program's intent to adapt the approved district's curriculum in ways that commensurate the needs of the gifted occurs

1 = 13% 2 = 5% 3 = 23% 4 = 32% 5 = 27%

PD32. The academic needs of my child were met

1 = 5% 2 = 5% 3 = 17% 4 = 23% 5 = 50%

PD33. The use of creative problem solving strategies and the opportunity for creativity in the gifted program occurred

1 = 9% 2 = 0% 3 = 5% 4 = 36% 5 = 50%

PD34. The use of individualized/independent study to meet students' area of giftedness was present

1 = 9% 2 = 13% 3 = 17% 4 = 48% 5 = 13%

PD35. A wide range of developmental skills, such as study skills and time management were present

1 = 4% 2 = 4% 3 = 39% 4 = 35% 5 = 18%

PD36. The use of higher level thinking skills occurred

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 22% 4 = 43% 5 = 31%

PD37. The academic instruction with teams of teachers over multiple years was a benefit for my child

1 = 4% 2 = 13% 3 = 22% 4 = 26% 5 = 35%

PD38. My child did benefit from having the same teachers for more than one year

1 = 9% 2 = 13% 3 = 22% 4 = 26% 5 = 30%

COMPONENT: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSITION

LE20. The sense of community present in the gifted program was felt by my child

1 = 9% 2 = 4% 3 = 17% 4 = 39% 5 = 31%

LE21. The group dynamics of working on many projects as a team was found by my child to be quite positive and challenging

1 = 9% 2 = 4% 3 = 17% 4 = 39% 5 = 31%

COMPONENT: LEARNING TRANSITION

LT1. My child was prepared for the elementary gifted program

1 = 17% 2 = 4% 3 = 9% 4 = 17% 5 = 53%

LT2. The transition from the regular classroom to the gifted program was smooth for my child

1 = 4% 2 = 4% 3 = 26% 4 = 26% 5 = 40%

LT3. My child was prepared for the middle school program

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 9% 4 = 30% 5 = 57%

LT4. The transition from the elementary program to the middle school program was smooth for my child

1 = 9% 2 = 0% 3 = 9% 4 = 32% 5 = 50%

LT5. My child was well prepared for high school

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 4% 4 = 39% 5 = 53%

LT6. The transition from the middle school program to the high school wa smooth for my child

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 17% 4 = 48% 5 = 31%

LT7. My child was well prepared for post high school

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 4% 4 = 35% 5 = 57%

LT8. The transition from high school to post high school was smooth for my child

1 = 9% 2 = 9% 3 = 0% 4 = 22% 5 = 60%

LT9. Concerning the goal of developing self-directed learners/independent workers and the management of one's own learning, my child increased in this area due to the participation in the gifted program

1 = 4% 2 = 0% 3 = 35% 4 = 13% 5 = 48%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

PAS3. Concerning your support for the program as a parent

___55%___ I strongly support the program.
___18%___ I support the program.
____0%___ I support the program with some reservations.
___27%___ I support the idea of the program, but have several reservations about its implementation to our system.

P28. Please describe your child's general attitude toward school, both before entering the gifted program and after being part of it. Please include what you found to be the most and least satisfactory experiences.

Before - "My child was bored with the pace of the K-3 curriculum." "She wasn't challenged before entering the program."

After - "I was happy to finally have my child's talents recognized by Fairfield City Schools. A great degree of achievement was lost by requiring students to go over basics before indulging in more advanced, creative work." "He was enthusiastic about things that interested him - never liked or learned from the "ingest & spit out" approach to learning. He usually looked for a different way to do things. This was accepted and encouraged

in TAG but that ended after 8th grade. High school teachers didn't appreciate anything unorthodox. Assignments were useless or repetitive so he didn't get good grades, though he knew the material." "The TAG stigma gave him a nudge to work up to his ability not just rest on his laurels." My daughter benefited so much; she loved the challenges and being with other gifted students (close friendships developed)." "After entering the program, she was more involved, challenged and interested."

Most Satisfactory - "The communication skills she learned in particular have been invaluable." "Opportunities for individual growth/exploration of talents." "He was more interested in school after the gifted program. He enjoyed all the interesting projects and team work." "The program satisfied his needs to do projects & to be creative in his approach to learning."

Least Satisfactory - " 4th grade - a bus driver telling them that they should behave better since they were so smart." "My child had only a limited number of friends upon entering high school." "In ele. (non TAG) teachers made unpleasant remarks about TAG students." " Least satisfactory was in English and S.S. in the middle school. He had a good foundation in math & science, but was tired of the program by the 8th grade."

P29. Please list extra-curricular and community activities in which your child has been involved (both in school and since high school).

The following are the categories and the frequency mentioned:

Sports (14)	Academic Clubs (12)
Community Service(10)	Music (9)
Church (8)	Leadership Grp. (7)
Clubs (6)	Frat./Sor. (6)
work (5)	Drama (4)
Yr. Bk/Newsp. (3)	Scouts (3)
Govt. (2)	

Please list your child's present occupation and title:

student (15); chemical engineer major(2); life insurance agent/acct. representative; electrical engineer; auditor with a large acct. firm; computer science; nurse's aide; chemist; S.S. education & asst. basketball coach; art & math education; special education & wife/mother;

preschool teacher; finance/management major; cadet at West Point & studying law; U.S. Naval Academy student; graduate student in anthropology/archaeology; psychology major.

What do we need to be doing more of?

"Computer usage (no time to take in Sr. high with only 6 periods and double science/math blocks)." "Realign the program in terms of criteria or call it advanced/honors." "Mainstreaming." "Teacher sensitivity to gifted & balance sex ratio." "We've been pleased with all aspects of the program." "Stressing the basics." "Strengthen the writing program." "Enhancing creative arts even more." "Prepare students for the real world and adversities they must face." "Enhancing high school program & continue creative challenges & avoid student boredom." "Teaching problem solving, thinking skills, research skills, integrate curriculum." "Develop self-reliance, promote student's ind. strengths and capacity to operate independently of the group." "Rotate teachers who work with the gifted - my son wasn't challenged by the same group by the 3rd year of the middle school program." "Starting at an earlier grade & having larger class sizes." "FMS gifted students interact in special areas with mainstream and repetition in weak areas." "More involvement in community concerns and involvement with business and career people." "IEP's for students - build on knowledge and encourage ind. development." "Learning for learning's sake and allowing room for failure."

What do we need to be doing less of?

"Busy work." "Don't keep telling these students that they're different." "Video teaching & not having the same teacher for 3 years." "Nothing - subject areas were taught well." "Basic lang. and writing skills & vocational enhancement." "Total separation all the time." "2 years with the same teachers are perfect; 3 years is quite awhile." "Activities which emphasize group dependence." "Complete isolation of students from others." "Help in study skills and organization." "Routines (though I don't think this was a problem)." "Encouraging academic competition between students and being satisfied with a generic mediocrity " "See the goal as jumping a hurdle, getting a job, making more money, being somebody better."

What do we need to continue to do?

"Teach algebra to eighth graders to count towards high school credit. Teach geometry to freshmen." "Continue with wonderful teachers that are dedicated to the program and to the students who are a part of it." "Encourage and challenge capable students."

"Everything you're doing now." "Providing academic challenges." "Teach curriculum, enrich, and enhance it for gifted kids." "Variety of methods, materials, and projects (interdisciplinary); retain those outstanding teachers." "Continue to offer more challenging approach for some students. My son was very well prepared for future learning situations upon graduation from Fairfield." "Keep the TAG program." "Work at each individual's pace and vary learning and teaching methods." "Large themed group projects. Individual emphasis on strengths (including creative) with help in weaker areas." "Build upon learning year to year through teachers who know the talents of their students." "Meet individual learning styles."

What new or additional components would you like to see added to our program?

"A seven period day at the senior high, if students are interested in music, or excuse student from gym requirement if they participate in a sport." "A program where students could progress at their own pace (not stop at their 'grade' level)." "High school gifted!" "More preparation in dealing with all educational levels and how to interact with all people." "Need resource people in the ele. schools who could work in our classes with gifted or bright children, who don't quite make the criteria." "Program continuation into high school - weaning from gifted environment should be gradual and supportive." "Mentorships outside the school." "Self esteem - separate from brains, abilities etc."

Appendix D

Administrator Survey

Administrator's Survey
Results (14 responded)

Key. 1 = no opinion
2 = not at all
3 = to some extent
4 = to a considerable extent
5 = to a great extent

(answer = number responded)

Identification and Placement

I3. Referrals of students to be considered for the program are sought from many sources:

1 = 15%, 2 = 0%; 3 = 31%, 4 = 39%, 5 = 15%

I4. The procedures used for identification of gifted students is effective for placement in the present gifted program:

1 = 7%; 2 = 0%; 3 = 36%; 4 = 57%; 5 = 0%

I5. Policies on entry into and exit from the program has been clearly stated and communicated:

1 = 8%; 2 = 23%; 3 = 31%; 4 = 15%; 5 = 23%

I6. The consistency of the identification procedures throughout the school system is clearly established and followed:

1 = 8%; 2 = 8%; 3 = 31%; 4 = 38%; 5 = 15%

Program Design and Curriculum

PD15. Continuity of services across grades K-12 is reflected in the total program:

1 = 7%; 2 = 29%; 3 = 36%; 4 = 29%; 5 = 0%

PD16. Facilities and equipment available meets the program's instructional goals:

1 = 29%; 2 = 7%; 3 = 21%; 4 = 29%; 5 = 14%

PD17. Overall, the program's impact on the total educational program in the schools is positive:

1 = 0%; 2 = 21%; 3 = 36%; 4 = 29%; 5 = 14%

PD20. The gifted curriculum objectives are reflected in the total program:

1 = 14%; 2 = 7%; 3 = 29%; 4 = 43%; 5 = 7%

PD21. Instructional goals are clearly stated and appropriate:

1 = 29%; 2 = 7%; 3 = 14%; 4 = 43%; 5 = 7%

PD22. The present scope and sequence (framework) for instruction is adequate for all teachers of gifted students:

1 = 38%; 2 = 8%; 3 = =16%; 4 = 38%; 5 = 0%

PD23. The differientiated instructional activities provide sequential development of skills across all grade levels served by the program:

1 = 36%, 2 = 0%, 3 = 21%, 4 = 43%, 5 = 0%

PD24. The program delivery system is appropriate for all areas of giftedness being served:

1 = 8%; 2 = 31%; 3 = 38%; 4 = 23%; 5 = 0%

PD25. Instructional resources used in classrooms and program services are consistently appropriate for implementing the curriculum:

1 = 25%; 2 = 25%; 3 = 33%; 4 = 17%; 5 = 0%

PD26. The teachers who implement the instructional program have received adequate training:

1 = 31%; 2 = 8%, 3 = 23%; 4 = 38%; 5 = 0%

PD27. The implemented program provides services to students in grades 4-8. In your opinion, what additional services need to be provided? Please check all that are appropriate:

_21%_K., _50%_prim., _29%_H.school, _36%_altern. serv.(gr. 4-8), _21%_ none

Personnel Selection And Development

PER1. The gifted coordinator has adequate time for performing responsibilities effectively:

1 = 23%; 2 = 8%; 3 = 0%; 4 = 46%; 5 = 23%

PER2 Your specific responsibilites as an administrator within the gifted program has been clearly communicated to you:

1 = 0%; 2 = 42%; 3 = 29%; 4 = 29%; 5 = 0%

PER4. Procedures for staff development and better servicing of gifted students is ongoing:

1 = 8%; 2 = 31%; 3 = 31%; 4 = 15%; 5 = 15%

Program Administration and Support

PAS6. Coordination among grade levels to ensure student progress through the gifted program has been fully and effectively developed:

1 = 0%; 2 = 15%; 3 = 46%; 4 = 31%; 5 = 8%

PAS6. Coordination among buildings to ensure student progress through the gifted program has been fully and effectively developed:

1 = 8%; 2 = 31%; 3 = 38%; 4 = 15%; 5 = 8%

PAS7. The buildings'* supplement to the overall program's budget is adequate for the needs of the program: *(South & Middle)

1 = 55%; 2 = 9%; 3 = 18%; 4 = 9%; 5 = 9%

PAS8. The number of staff members working with the gifted students in the program is appropriate for the number of students served:

1 = 23%; 2 = 8%; 3 = 8%; 4 = 23%; 5 = 38% **(142)**

PAS9. As an administrator I am:

__21%__ well informed concerning the needs of the gifted.

__50%__ adequate informed concerning the needs of the gifted.

__29%__ desire additional in-service concerning the gifted.

Please identify what you consider to be the major strengths and the major weaknesses of the gifted program:

Strengths: A good program.
A major strength is pupil/teacher ratio.
Personnel.
District funds are allocated to serve these children.
Teacher experience/continuity.
Well articulated curriculum document.
Reputable program.
Dedicated teachers.
Experienced staff and their strong background in their subject areas.
Teaching staff and teaming.
Interdisciplinary curriculum.
Students are identified and a program is provided.

Weaknesses: Labeling is an issue.
The program only serves the academically gifted students. We need to expand the program into the "arts".
Students are labeled as gifted in all areas & not specific areas.
Complete isolation from mainstream in the Middle School.
Isolation of children.
Not providing social & intra-personal skills training.
Not addressing seven areas of intelligence (per Gardner).
Using total group instruction (even all 40 students) instead of individual project learning.
Lack of advocacy & responsiveness to anti-gifted sentiment (but a challenge for anyone).
Isolation of students.
Small number of students targeted/services.
Combination of grades with one person giving instruction.
Students removed from home school.
The arts should be an integral instructional component.

We need to have more dialogue among the teachers and gifted selection team to determine which students meet the criteria for selection into the program.

More emphasis needs to be placed on the classroom's teachers' input on individual student performance.

What do we need to be doing more of?

Service - Providing service to more students. More emphasis on students who are found to be gifted in 1 or 2 areas. Collaboration w/other students and staff, striving to continue to be a part of existing school through deeds of positive things. Explore alt. service delivery models (pending acquisition of more computers). Looking for alternatives to provide services for gifted students in home buildings. Providing classroom teachers with the educational materials, equipment and support to meet the needs of advanced students.

Interdisciplinary - More true interdisciplinary planning & instructing. More interdisciplinary work & teaming between math & science at Middle School.

Prevent Isolation - Work to prevent the isolation of the students esp. in the 8th grade. All the students in the program to interact more w/the mainstream students. Their education is lacking in experience. More discussion between regular and VISIONS teachers.

Inservice - Inservicing teachers: teaching to all intelligences, project learning, interpersonal and intrapersonal skill development. Inservicing classroom teachers on instructional strategies for dealing w/gifted students in a reg. class. Staff inservice: need to identify, strategies to address their needs, and inservice for all staff on instructional strategies for gifted students are appropriate for students at all levels.

Misc. - Provide learning experiences that build technological skills. Seek more active parent involvement and offer more affective experiences for students. Communication between schools on the success of the students who are in the program to their original school. Tracking of students when they come to the h. school. What happens to them here? How do they perform relative to other students? Parents also need to have education on topics relative to their child's needs.

What do we need to be doing less of?

Isolation - Isolating these children in a pull out program
Separating students from other students.

Misc. - Labeling students as all or none in the gifted areas. Less purely academic/cognitive focus; interdisciplinary analysis, synthesis, and evaluation activites (cooperative and independent). Evaluation of the program really needs to be an ongoing process.

What do we need to continue to do?

Meeting Needs - Meet the needs of the students you serve. Focus on needs of each child, attempting to challenge & support through appropriate instructional strategies & curriculum. Look for other instructional strategies for meeting the needs of g. students in all areas of giftedness - not just linguistics & mathematical.

Misc. - Keep a strong gifted program. Review current research on the effects of pull-out programs. Survey former students. Look for more ways to enhance the program. Provide the program. Continue to provide information to the staff and parents on the goals of the VISIONS program.

**** Concerns: Can't we service our g. students w/in the regular classroom setting? Gifted students needs met to some extent in the regular classroom ***

What components are missing from our present program?

- Counseling support.
- A K-3 program.
- Financial backing to provide an updated technological environment for independent learning.
- Staff development/orientataion (to overcome misperceptions, stereotyping of students & program), active parent involvement opportunities.
- Staff (other than VISIONS teachers) needs a better understanding of the operation of the VISIONS program. They view it as a protected entity and much concern over the small class size.
- Need to consider other models of providing services to gifted students.
- Put curriculum in line with present state models for proficiency testing.
- Place entire program at Middle School in one area.
- Parent education and counseling.
- Develop study skills program.

Appendix E

Counselor Survey

Counselor Survey Results
(4 responded)

COMPONENT: IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

I3. Referrals of students to be considered for the program are sought from many sources:

no opinion ---- 50%
not at all ----- 25%
to a considerable extent ---- 25%

I4. The procedures used for identification of gifted students is effective for placement in the present gifted program:

no opinion ---- 50%
to a considerable extent ---- 25%
to a great extent ---- 25%

I6. The consistency of the identification procedures throughout the school system is clearly established and followed:

no opinion ---- 75%
to some extent ---- 25%

COMPONENT: PROGRAM DESIGN AND CURRICULUM

PD19. The program's goals of preparing students for the future is reflected in the total program.

no opinion ---- 100%

PD27. The implemented program provides services to students in grades 4-8. In your opinion, what additional services need to be provided? Please check all that are appropriate.

primary ---- 20%
H. School ---- 20%
alt. serv. 4-8 ---- 20%
none ---- 40%

COMPONENT: PERSONNEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

PER2. Training for counselor personnel to meet the needs of gifted students has been adequate:

no opinion ---- 25%
not at all ---- 50%
to some extent ---- 25%

PER4. Procedures for staff development and better servicing of gifted students is ongoing:

no opinion ----- 75%
to a considerable extent ----- 25%

What do we need to be doing more of?

"We need to increase the public's and school employee's knowledge, awareness and information about the program."
" These students need to be recognized more for their talents. It is always sad at the Awards Assembly, very, very few are given recognition, yet students in all the other levels are being awarded plaques and certificates. Somehow, our grading system doesn't 'jive'". "Evidently the students are placed in appropriate tracks for academic preparation and challenge."

What do we need to be doing less of?

What do we need to continue to do?

"Make sure that the students are enjoying the program, being challenged, and continuing to achieve. Keep them to be as enthusiastic learners as possible."

What components are missing from our present program?

"We don't know what it is."
" I can certainly see the advantage of having the same 4 teachers for 3 years, but the complaints I hear are we need a little more variety. Some students have mentioned they liked the teachers, but not for 3 years."

Bibliography

Badiali, Bernard J. (1987). An Assessment of the Unionville Chadds Ford Model for Effective Schools. Penn State University.

Badiali, Bernard J., & McClure, John R. Hots: An Evaluation Study. Penn State University. (In cooperation with Central Intermediate Unit 10 and Bald Eagle Area School District).

Callahan, Carolyn & Caldwell, Michael S. (1986). Critical Issues in Gifted Education. "Defensive Evaluation of Programs for the Gifted and Talented", U.S. Pro-Ed, Inc., 277-296.

Dinham, Sarah M. & Udall, Anne J. (1986). Critical Issues in Gifted Education. "Evaluation for Gifed Ed: Sythesis & Discussion", U.S. Pro-Ed, Inc., 297-316.

Fairfield City School District, The Gifted Program Course of Study. Grades 4-8.

Gallagher, James J. (1993). Critical Issues in Gifted Education. "Comments on McDaniel's 'Education of the Gifted & the Excellence - Equity Debate'", U.S. Pro-Ed, Inc., 19-21.

Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted in Virginia School Divisions. (September 1988). Kraus Microfilm.

Hughes, P. Edward., Scherer, David, & Hirschy, Patricia. (1991). The Tower Hill Gifted Research Program : A Report of an Experimental Evaluation. Trillium Press, Unionville, NY.

Kulik, C-L.C. (1985). *Effects of inter-class ability groupings on achievement and self-esteem.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Kulik, C-L.C. & Kulik, J. (1984). *Effects of ability grouping on elementary school pupils: A meta-analysis.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Ontario, Canada.

Kulik, J.A. & Kulik, C-L.C. (1982). Effects of ability on secondary school students: A meta-analysis of evaluation findings. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 415-428.

Kulik, J.A. & Kulik, C-L.C. (1984). Effects of accelerated instruction on students, *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 409-425.

Kulik, J.A. & Kulik, C-L.C. (1990). Ability grouping and gifted students. In N. Colangelo & G.A. Davis (Eds.) *Handbook of gifted education* (178-196). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Maker, C. June. (1986). Critical Issues in Gifted Education. "Defensible Programs for Gifted Students: What are They?" U.S.: Pro-Ed, Inc., 319-347.

McDaniel, Thomas R. (1993). Critical Issues in Gifted Education. "Education of the Gifted and the Excellence - Equity Debate: Lessons from History", U.S.: Pro-Ed, Inc., 6-17.

Rogers, K.B. (1991). *A best-evidence synthesis of the research on accelerative options for gifted students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota, Minn.

Slavin, R.E. (1987). Ability grouping: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, 293-336.

Slavin, R.E. (1990). Achievement effects of ability grouping in secondary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 60, 471-499.

Telesis (1986). Ohio's Classroom of the Future. Dept. of Ed.